

As we commemorate and reflect on the 60th anniversary of *Brown v. Board of Education*, let us be mindful of the progress we have made and acknowledge that there is still much work to be done. The future of our Nation and our children depends on us.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my colleagues to honor the 60th Anniversary of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, a decision which was a major step toward education equality in the United States, and launched a Civil Rights movement that was a turning point for our country. I am reminded of heroes like Justice Thurgood Marshall, James Meredith, the Little Rock Nine, the lawyers who fought in the courtroom, and the many civil rights activists who risked their lives to fight for equality. But while the decision changed the law of the land, it didn't immediately change the reality of education inequality in America.

Chief Justice Earl Warren gave the opinion of the Court, stating "In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." Thus, we see the Court firmly establishing the critical role education has on a child's success.

Even during the time directly following the court decision, all states and localities did not follow the precedent set by the ruling. This played out in national news across the country and was clearly seen at Central High School in Little Rock, Arkansas when a group of black students, known as the Little Rock Nine, was blocked by the National Guard from entering the school, under orders from then Governor Orval Faubus. Additionally, in the second *Brown* case, commonly referred to as *Brown II*, Chief Justice Earl Warren urged school districts to implement the principles promptly and with "all deliberate speed."

Over the years, various federal and state laws and initiatives have been introduced in an effort to improve education, yet today, there is still more work that can be done to ensure that every child has equal access to a world-class education. Sixty years later, we are still fighting for access to affordable early childhood education and higher education, and also for the reduction of dropout rates. Additionally, the school-to-prison pipeline is not merely a theory, but is a reality for many of our students across the country and is hindering them from access to educational opportunities. We must take a multi-faceted approach to remedying education as we prepare our students to enter the workforce in our global economy.

Even those who are educated and are entering the workforce have a tough road ahead of them. The gender pay gap is a harsh reality of the day in which we live. This is not reflective of equity, thus we must do all we can to ensure our students have the tools needed to enter the workforce as qualified individuals and be able to fully seize opportunities.

On this important anniversary, let us remember the words of Justice Thurgood Marshall, who argued this case as a NAACP chief counsel, "None of us got where we are solely by pulling ourselves up by our bootstraps. We got here because somebody . . . bent down and helped us pick up our boots." Today, let us never forget the message of *Brown* as we work to ensure equal access to education, a

strong workforce, and an open door to opportunity for all.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we honor the living, breathing legacy of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, we must acknowledge our role in combatting the resurgence of segregation in our nation's public schools. I know my personal journey was paved in the shadow of this landmark decision. As of a proud product of Selma High School and its first black valedictorian, I know firsthand what is possible when provided a quality education. I graduated from Princeton, Harvard, and Oxford on the backs of so many trailblazers who went before me. I stand on the shoulders of so many who were denied access to great public schools in the name of institutionalized segregation.

So it is incredibly discouraging to know that our nation's schools today are more segregated than they were in 1968 or any time since. I am appalled that there are children growing up today in the 7th Congressional District and across this country who are less likely to be afforded a quality education than I was. As old battles become new again, we must recommit to knocking down every barrier that stands in the way of school integration.

To tackle this growing trend in our schools, we must attack residential racial segregation, as it is harder to integrate our schools while communities where children live are equally as segregated. Black and white, poor and non-poor children are more isolated from each other than any other group in the U.S. population. Housing and school policy are inextricably intertwined.

Nowhere is this resurgence more evident than in the 7th Congressional District of Alabama at Central High School in Tuscaloosa. Just a decade ago, Central High School was one of the South's signature integration success stories with a dropout rate less than half of Alabama's average. In 2000, a desegregation mandate was lifted from Tuscaloosa City Schools. And after a series of zoning changes, Central High School is now 99 percent black with a 66 percent graduation rate. And just blocks away, more affluent students are zoned for Northridge High School with an 81 percent graduation rate, higher test scores and more funding.

Today, nearly one in three black students in Tuscaloosa attends a school that looks as if our schools had never been integrated. And black children in the South attend majority-black schools at levels unseen in forty years.

In addition, students across the 7th District are disproportionately injured by racially discriminatory property tax restrictions that impede the ability to raise state and local revenues adequately to fund public education. This separation of our children across school districts, municipal boundaries and property tax lines is immoral and is a threat to the ideals of equality that underscore our democracy.

The trends are clear, as judges across the south have lifted federal desegregation court orders, school districts have retracted the progress made by *Brown v. Board of Education*, moving back towards the debilitating state of segregation: Less than a third of schools serving high concentrations of minority students offer calculus, black students who spend 5 years in desegregated schools earn 25 percent more than those who don't. African American and latino students are taught by a teacher with 3 years of experience or less al-

most twice as often as their peers and the odds that any given teacher will have significant experience, full licensure or a master's degree all declines as a school's black population increases.

We cannot ignore the residential isolation of our nation's most disadvantaged children and the opportunity gaps they endure as a result. Integrated schools and communities enable low-income students to enjoy the same AP courses as their middle-class peers, and better access to quality teachers and adequate resources.

And to achieve school integration, we will need to make more concerted efforts to integrate our neighborhoods by prioritizing affordable housing in communities with good schools. How we address zoning policies and demographic changes will determine our future.

Today, we cannot honestly expect our low-income, minority children to succeed in life when they are zoned for schools that are substandard, under-resourced and underfunded. These educational and housing inequities have a devastating impact on our students and our communities, and ultimately, our nation's ability to compete globally.

As we enjoy the benefits of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, we must work together to ensure that no one growing up in America is denied a quality education because of the school they are zoned to attend, the color of their skin or the amount of money they have. It is our job to do no less!

So sixty years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, we must honor the legacies of Vivian Moore, James Hood, Ruby Bridges and James Meredith by launching an assault on modern-day constructions of segregation in our schools and communities.

#### CLANDESTINE INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, tonight I wanted to discuss issues regarding the PATRIOT Act. As I understand it, we will be taking up a vote, come Thursday, on what is called the USA FREEDOM Act, I believe. I know that there was a lot of work put into negotiating a compromise there, but I still have a concern, as I did when I was a freshman, with the language in the PATRIOT Act.

This is language here from the PATRIOT Act, 50 U.S.C., section 1861, that allows the Federal Government to go into very personal matters and very personal documentation of individuals. Some of us felt like it was allowing the Federal Government to get more than the Federal Government should be entitled to get. There is similar language in the FISA Act.

But this language says that the Director of the FBI or a designee of the Director may make an application for an order requiring the production of tangible things, including books, records, papers, documents, and other

items for an investigation to obtain foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person or to protect against international terrorism or clandestine intelligence activities.

And there was a provision put in there that says such investigation of a United States person is not conducted solely upon the basis of activities protected by the First Amendment to the Constitution.

And back when I was a freshman and this language was being discussed back in '05, '06, during that time frame, I pointed out that it seems like throughout the PATRIOT Act they keep referring to "international," "foreign," as this does, foreign intelligence information, international terrorism, other language with similar references. So I thought, well, that is strange, though, that when it mentions clandestine intelligence activities, that is a vague enough term, it doesn't include the words "foreign," "international." So I was quite concerned about that. And the Bush administration representatives made clear: Look, Congressman, "foreign," "international," that is all the way through this stuff. You don't have to worry about it. It has to do with foreign contacts.

So if there is no foreign contact, then the PATRIOT Act doesn't apply because that is throughout the act. It has got to be foreign. It has got to have an international element to it. And so much so that I encouraged my colleagues that were concerned about their own phone logs being gathered that, if they simply avoided using their phone or had foreign terrorists call another number and not their own phone, they ought to be okay, being a bit sarcastic.

Well, it turns out that my concerns about the use of the terms "clandestine intelligence activities" were apparently spot-on, that despite the assurances from the Gonzales Justice Department that, oh, no, it has to be foreign, it has to be international, if there is not that element in it, then it doesn't really comply. And I said: But it doesn't say that with regard to clandestine intelligence activities.

I mean, clandestine. So somebody peeping over a wall to see what they can see. I mean, technically, that could be considered clandestine, gathering intelligence. Look up the word "intelligence." It is pretty all-encompassing, anything that gathers information.

So it wouldn't take much to get an order granting virtually any information the Federal Government is seeking, even though there is no contact with a Federal agent, Federal Government, a foreign entity of any kind. It is not there, and it needs to be there.

□ 2030

Unfortunately, when I raised this glaring hole, the people who negotiated this bill, my friend, JIM SENSENBRENNER from Wisconsin, and I think BOBBY SCOTT, they were a bit defen-

sive. Gee, we have our deal, and so you can't—we can't allow an amendment even though it has got very wide and bipartisan support. If one goes back and looks at how the vote on my amendment went when it passed, it was very bipartisan. We had some folks that would be considered very liberal Democrats along with some of us who are considered very conservative. But the united concern that allowed my amendment to pass was about having terms "clandestine intelligence activities" that would allow the Federal Government basically to get an order to go snooping on fishing expeditions based on very little, and certainly nothing to do with terrorism. It opened the door to orders for information, even though they had no link whatsoever of any kind or in any way to terrorism, just if they want to do a fishing expedition.

Although we were assured by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales—a great Texan and a smart man—he assured us the National Security Letters were not being abused that allowed them to gather information, that there were no abuses here in the PATRIOT Act. An IG inspector's report indicated that there was widespread, massive abuse from Federal agents who were simply on fishing expeditions, just gathering information and gathering documents as they saw fit that had no link and no tie to any type of foreign terrorism.

So I was hoping to get this fixed. It is a hole big enough in the PATRIOT Act that a truck could be driven through it by Federal agents coming to unload all kinds of private information that American citizens may have, even though such American citizens have no ties with terrorism, no ties with foreign agents, and no ties with foreign governments. They left a gaping hole in what is being called a fix to the PATRIOT Act abuses.

Unfortunately, though my amendment passed to remedy this problem, though it passed in committee, a few amendments later, maybe one or two amendments later, we had votes we had to come to the floor for, and I had a conflict, and by the time I got back, they had already called a re-vote on my amendment, and without requiring a recorded vote, it was voice voted and the amendment was voted down.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that people in America will get the message that this administration wants to protect its ability to get information on any American, whether they have any ties to terrorism, whether they have got any ties to foreign governments, any ties to foreign agents, any ties to anything that might give some of us concern—you don't have to have those.

If they can assert that you may be gathering clandestine intelligence—intelligence meaning any information; you may call a Federal office and ask for information—they may decide, gee, that is a clandestine attempt to gather intelligence. Mr. Speaker, there used to be an old joke that is not so funny

anymore about the guy that called the FBI office and said, here is my name, and I demand to know if you have got a Federal FBI file on me, and the answer was: "We do now." That used to be a joke. "We didn't have one until now." And that used to be cute. It is not so cute anymore because under the language that so-called negotiators drafted, that massive hole that allows the gathering of information on American citizens will remain in the bill, and will remain part of the PATRIOT Act unless it is fixed.

I will have an amendment to this bill. The Rules Committee may or may not allow it to come to the floor. If the Speaker doesn't want it to come to the floor, it is not likely it will come to the floor. And if that is the case, I will have to vote against this so-called fix to the PATRIOT Act because it doesn't fix it. It just allows more cover for the Federal Government, with a massive hole for anybody that wants to gather information on anybody.

We need to fix it. We don't need to have an act that allows Federal agents, whether it was the Bush administration, as they were doing, whether it is the Obama administration, as they have been doing, or a future administration—whether Republican or Democrat—we need to stop fishing expeditions.

That should be bipartisan. It was bipartisan until the negotiators of the so-called fix got very protective and decided they were not accepting such an amendment that would close this gaping hole that allows abuse by the Federal Government.

I hope it will be reconsidered, but unless there is a lot of push from the public, Mr. Speaker, I doubt that they are going to be any less protective of their negotiated work, and so it will allow this administration to continue spying and getting information on American citizens that I would contend is not appropriate at all.

That terminology is used a number of other places in the PATRIOT Act. There is another place, 18 U.S.C., 1844, regarding pen registers, you know, phone logs, trap-and-trace devices to allow the Federal Government to trace calls and all, they use similar language. There, in that part of federal law, it authorizes the Attorney General or designated attorney for the government to get an order against anybody who is attempting to obtain foreign intelligence information as long as—it says this—it is not concerning a United States person, number one, or number two, to protect against international terrorism, or three, clandestine intelligence activities. And that is what I was concerned about 9 years ago in my freshman term.

I said, wait a minute, clandestine intelligence activities, that doesn't protect American citizens. Oh, but look up there in the part before. It says, it has to be information not concerning a U.S. person. I said, yeah, but then it has the disjunctive word "or." Yeah,

but then in that next part it says, international terrorism, it has to be international. No, but after that, it has another disjunctive "or," so any one of these can apply, or it can be for clandestine intelligence activities even if it is a United States person, even if it is not involving international terrorism, or someone who has had contact with a foreign agent.

In another part, it references a certification by the applicant. Well, this is the exact wording:

There must be a certification by the applicant that the information likely to be obtained is foreign intelligence information not concerning a United States person, or is relevant to an ongoing investigation to protect against international terrorism, or clandestine intelligence activities.

Again, that third part, even in this statute, leaves that gaping hole, "clandestine intelligence activities." That is such a wide open phrase. It is such a hole. It doesn't limit it to foreign agents. It doesn't limit it to U.S. citizens who have contact with foreign terrorists, foreign agents. It doesn't have to be part of some kind of some international terrorism scheme. It allows Federal agents to gather information about—as it did under the Bush administration, as it has been allowing under the Obama administration, and as it would allow under future Republican or Democratic administrations—any American citizen that the Federal Government contends might be getting information about something that they consider private.

"Clandestine intelligence activities." A lovely triple term, triple-word term, that could be a gaping hole and is a gaping hole in federal law that needs to be fixed. But unless Members of both sides of the aisle come forward—as they initially did when I first proposed the amendment to fix this gaping hole—and vote in a bipartisan manner to close that gaping hole, then it is going to continue to be a problem with the Federal Government gathering information on U.S. citizens who have nothing to do with terrorism—nothing. There is no requirement that they have anything to do with terrorism; they can still be caught in this Federal web if they determine you have been picking up information somewhere. Maybe you visited a Federal Web site, and from the inquiry you made, they thought, hmm, that may be looking like they are trying to clandestinely gather information. Let's go get an order and see what all they have been doing lately.

So that is the bad news. The law needs to be fixed. The PATRIOT Act needs to be fixed desperately. There is a bill apparently coming on Thursday that says it will be fixing the problem, but it doesn't fix the problem. It leaves the hole for the Federal Government. You might as well not have a bill even though there are some good things in it.

So I hope that people will wake up. I know the bill's proponents don't want

any amendments. They say it will mess up their ticklish deal that they negotiated, which is a bit of a problem. I am sure there will be people who come to the floor and say, this bill is a freedom act that has gone through the regular order. That means normally that it has gone through a subcommittee legislative hearing, subcommittee markup, full committee legislative hearing, full committee markup where we vote on amendments, and anybody can bring any amendments. But, Mr. Speaker, I would humbly submit that when somebody negotiates a backroom deal and then they come to committee and convince the chair, the Speaker, that this deal is too ticklish, you can't allow any amendments to actually pass at committee, that is not regular order.

Regular order is when you are allowed to bring amendments, you have full debate, and if you make your case, as I did, and the vote passes, the amendment becomes part. It does not mean that you come back because the proponents of the bill have convinced the chairman and a few others, gee, we have got to slip this amendment back up for another vote and vote it down because we don't want any amendments to the deal we negotiated. That is not regular order. That is not getting full and fair debate and vote at committee level when someone negotiates a backroom deal and then says that you can't ever amend it because we have got a special backroom deal here.

□ 2045

It is time to wake up and fix the PATRIOT Act, and if it is not fixed, then we get rid of it. It is that simple.

On the other hand, if you are a big fan of Big Brother, the all-seeing Orwellian eye watching everything that an American citizen is doing, then you will be encouraged because, under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is going to have everybody's health care records.

If you see a psychiatrist, the Federal Government will have those records. Whoever you see, whatever it is for, no matter how personal and private it is, the Federal Government will have your records.

Now, you might say: well, but the Federal Government has firewalls, they don't let people see records who are not supposed to.

Well, tell that to the thousand or so people whose FBI records were found in the Clinton White House. Just possessing one FBI file inappropriately sent Chuck Colson to prison, yet the Clinton White House had a thousand of them.

Fortunately for the Clinton administration, they had an Attorney General who was not about to prosecute their bosses at the White House; but as I understand it, a thousand FBI files could be 2,000 years in prison. It could be 4,000, but I think it is 2,000. I think it is two minimum per file that you have.

If I recall correctly, I think Chuck Colson did about a year and a half for

having one FBI file. So it is interesting.

Some people we were told whose FBI files were located at the White House may have changed their position on legislation that was before the Congress. When you know the most secret—most intimate secrets about people in this country, it is just amazing what you can get them to do.

The Federal Government, if they have all of your health care records, they know everything; and having listened to friends across the aisle stand down here and berate Republicans—we don't want the Federal Government in our bedroom—and yet, they turn around and vote for a bill without a single Republican vote that puts the Federal Government in the bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, dining room, it puts the Federal Government in every aspect of your life.

Then we have this Consumer Financial Protection Bureau who apparently has now determined, gee, they need people's credit card, debit card records, so they can protect them; they will service them.

Back home, I grew up and heard cattlemen talk about taking the cow down the road to be serviced by a bull, and I can't help but wonder what kind of service it is that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau is giving to the American citizen. They say: we want to gather up everybody's records so we can protect them.

When the Federal Government has everybody's personal information, Americans are not protected. They are subjected to being subjects because the Federal Government can manipulate people as they wish.

This is the very kind of thing that the Founders were afraid of, one of the many they were afraid of and thought that they had protected us from because they gave the Congress the power of the purse; and they really believed that, if an executive branch becomes too abusive, as with the Gonzales Justice Department—and I don't believe for a minute that Attorney General Gonzales had any idea that all of these thousands of letters were going out with the power of a subpoena to get people's most personal information, just a fishing expedition, I don't think he knew.

But just like if someone is in charge of the VA for 5-and-a-half years and the VA has become abusive to the detriment and death of people they were supposed to be taking care of, it is time to get a new coach—somebody, whether they are a war hero or not, as the current head of the VA, somebody that will come in and clean house and demand accountability and get it. It is time.

We have been hearing discussions also here in Washington for quite some time about how we have got to provide legal status, some kind of amnesty to young people who came into the United States without being adults, so they really didn't have a say; therefore, we

need to give them some type of amnesty.

As I have repeatedly contended and submit, we have got to stop talking about legal status amnesty, anything of that kind, until the border is secure. Anyone who says I have ever advocated for the border being sealed is a liar.

I have advocated and continue to advocate for the border to be secure. I want immigration. We need immigration in the United States, but it needs to be legal. It needs to be people that are authorized to come into the United States.

We also need immigration reform, but until we have a President—I would welcome it being this President—but until we have a President who will secure the border and make sure it is only people who legally come into the country, then there is no reason to pass an immigration reform bill because he will continue to ignore the law he doesn't like and only follow laws he does like, just as he has already done on immigration issues.

We have heard from Chris Crane, as the union representative for the Border Patrol. I have talked to a number of border patrolmen. They say the same thing, that when people talk about legal status or amnesty here in Washington, it creates a magnet drawing people from foreign countries into this country because they think: gee, I have got to get there quickly before the border is secured because I am going to get amnesty if I can just get there.

It hasn't been that many years ago when there were only a handful of children who came into the country illegally, that we knew of. The estimates were many, many, many times that. It was estimated this year that there will probably be 60,000 children come into this country by the end of this year. Now, we hear that we have had more than 60,000 come in already, and it is just May.

The conservative bastion of newspapers, The New York Times—Mr. Speaker, I am prone to sarcasm—had an article dated May 16, "U.S. Setting Up Emergency Shelter in Texas as Youths Cross Border Alone."

This an article by Julia Preston that says the following:

With border authorities in south Texas overwhelmed by a surge of young illegal migrants traveling by themselves, the Department of Homeland Security declared a crisis this week and moved to set up an emergency shelter for the youths at an Air Force base in San Antonio, officials said Friday.

After seeing children packed in a Border Patrol station in McAllen, Texas, during a visit last Sunday, Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson on Monday declared "a level-four condition of readiness" in the Rio Grande Valley. The alert was an official recognition that Federal agencies overseeing borders, immigration enforcement, and child welfare had been outstripped by a sudden increase in unaccompanied minors in recent weeks.

Mr. Speaker, let me interject here. When I talk about the fact that we hear from border patrolmen that legal status and amnesty is talked about

here in Washington, it becomes a magnet and draws people in, and for all of the children that are drawn in illegally, you know that some get sucked into sex slavery.

Human trafficking becomes an even bigger business, and reporters wonder: Gee, what makes you think they are coming in greater numbers just because people are talking about amnesty here in the United States Congress?

The proof is there for anyone who has eyes to see and ears to hear.

This New York Times article goes on:

On Sunday, Department of Health and Human Services officials will open a shelter for up to 1,000 minors at Lackland Air Force Base in Texas, authorities said, and will begin transferring youths there by land and air. The level-four alert is the highest for agencies handling children crossing the border illegally and allows Homeland Security officials to call on emergency resources from other agencies, officials said.

In an interview on Friday, Mr. Johnson said the influx of unaccompanied youths had "zoomed to the top of my agenda" after his encounters at the McAllen Border Patrol station with small children, one of whom was 3.

The children are coming primarily from El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, making the perilous journey north through Mexico to Texas without parents or close adult relatives. Last weekend alone, more than 1,000 unaccompanied youths were being held at overflowing border stations in south Texas, officials said.

The flow of child migrants has been building since 2011, when 4,059 unaccompanied youths were apprehended by border agents. Last year, more than 21,000 minors were caught, and Border Patrol officials said they were expecting more than 60,000 this year, but that projection has already been exceeded.

By law, unaccompanied children caught crossing illegally from countries other than Mexico are treated differently from other migrants. After being apprehended by the Border Patrol, they must be turned over within 72 hours to a refugee resettlement office that is part of the Health Department. Health officials must try to find relatives or other adults in the United States who can care for them while their immigration cases move through the courts, a search that can take several weeks or more.

The Health Department maintains shelters for the youths, most run by private contractors, in the border regions. Health officials had begun, several months ago, to add beds in the shelters, anticipating a seasonal increase. But the plans proved insufficient to handle a drastic increase of youths in recent weeks, a senior administration official said.

Mr. Speaker, I spoke with someone with a church group that was called for help from the Department of Homeland Security saying: We have exceeded our capacity to protect these children. We are asking church groups that can help, please come help.

This person said it was clear that some of the young children, females had been raped, and you can't help but wonder for the thousand that made it across last week in that one area in Texas, how many got lured into sex trafficking.

Oh, sure, we will get you to the United States. As a young child, we

will get you there, and once you are there, President Obama will make sure you are taken care of, and you just come with us.

For heaven's sake, one of these was 3 years old, and we have people here in this building saying: Oh, no, children never come by themselves. They would never make that choice to come by themselves. The only people who would ever come illegally would be parents who bring the children without choices.

□ 2100

Well, because of the talk of amnesty in this town and because we do not have a secured border, then this administration and this Congress also is complicit in helping lure people into sex trafficking, into horrible situations, even people trying to cross deserts who don't make it. That should not be.

We owe Americans, we owe the world the obligation to keep our oath, to follow, to support the Constitution of the United States. That requires us to follow the laws, not pick and choose which Federal laws we care to ignore because we don't like them, as our Attorney General has advocated. That makes him a violator of his constitutional oath. We should be following in our oaths, not breaking them.

When you hear about children being lured into this country by promises made by people in this town as to how good it is going to be—oh, we are going to get amnesty through, and for any child that can get here before the border is secured so we only allow legally approved people in, just come on, however you can get here—we are luring people into horrible, horrible situations.

It is time to start acting responsibly. That does not mean that we continue to send the message that is being signaled by this administration that, gee, if you can just get to the United States as a child, we will take care of you. If we can't find your parents who are illegally in the country, then we will find somebody to take care of you legally. We are going to allow you to overwhelm this country.

We have people saying, oh, if we just legalize everybody that is here, all of this new tax money will come flooding in. People that are working are already paying taxes, and we have an awful lot of people that are working who are not legally here, who are getting vast amounts of money for their child tax credit that allows them to get back more money than they put in.

There can be no debate that young children who are not working, even if they are legalized, for those who make the argument, gee, look at all the tax money that the Federal coffers will be getting if we just legalize everybody here, that is a bogus argument. It is a strained argument by people who want more people coming in illegally.

It is time we took our oath seriously, began enforcing our laws, not sealing

the border, but securing the border. Once it is secured, as confirmed by border States, not by Homeland Security that can't be trusted, but by border States, unanimously telling us, okay, Federal Government, we can affirm, we can certify that the border to our State is secure, then we can move ahead with immigration reform. Until that time, we need to quit talking about it. Anybody that is tempted to continue talking about it needs to go down to the border and see a 3-year-old that got lured into this country because of that kind of talk: Just get here.

Obviously, a 3-year-old had someone convince them that they needed to try to get here and helped to get them here. I wonder how many other 3-year-olds got talked into coming along for the ride and didn't make it? Maybe their parents or some loved one paid money to human traffickers thinking, gee, if I can get my really young child into the United States, then they get amnesty, then they can claim me as their parent so I can come in, and then I can take care of them even though I am not an American citizen, and that will allow them to draw more people in. So it is foreseeable that parents could send children.

It is tough to ever give up a child. Moses' mother did it to try to secure a better life for him.

How many parents have let their child go with human traffickers, hoping for a better life for their child, only to find out later their child never made it to America? Sending them from South America, from Central America, across country, clear across the length of Mexico has got to be a risky move.

This story from *The New York Times* says:

Mr. Johnson said the young migrants became a more "vivid" issue for him after he persuaded his wife to spend Mother's Day with him at the station in McAllen. He said he asked a 12-year-old girl where her mother was. She responded tearfully that she did not have a mother, and was hoping to find her father who was living somewhere in the United States, Mr. Johnson said.

Mr. Johnson said he had spoken on Monday with the ambassadors from Mexico and the three central American countries to seek their cooperation, and had begun a publicity campaign to dissuade youths from embarking for the United States.

"We have to discourage parents from sending for their children to cross the southwest border because of the risks involved. A south Texas processing center is no place for a child," Mr. Johnson said.

Officials said many youths are fleeing gang violence at home, while some are seeking to unite with parents in the United States. A majority of unaccompanied minors are not eligible to remain legally in the United States and are eventually returned home.

Well, Secretary Johnson can say we need to dissuade more young people from trying to make the perilous trip across Latin America, Central America to try to get into the United States, but actions speak louder than words. When the actions are that, if you can just get to the United States, Mr. Johnson's Homeland Security will take

care of you, will get you three hot meals, a bed to sleep in, if we can't find your parents illegally in the United States, then we will find you some other parents, people are being drawn in.

They know if their child comes in and is given a legal place, a legal status, then they will be able to come in on the backs of their children's legal status so they can take care of them.

It is time to stop the luring of young children across the border by the activities of this administration. It is time for Congress to stop luring people across the border by talk of amnesty. It is time to stop. And as if that wasn't bad enough, there was an article today, from Breitbart, by Caroline May. It says:

The Department of Homeland Security has only requested that the State Department invoke visa sanctions against a country that refuses or delays accepting an immigrant facing deportation back to their country once, over a decade ago.

The article says:

A State Department official confirmed to Breitbart News Monday that the only time the State Department invoked visa sanctions at the request of DHS was in 2001 against Guyana.

Last week the Center for Immigration Studies reported that an internal Immigration and Customs Enforcement document revealed that last year ICE released 36,007 criminal immigrants awaiting the outcome of deportation proceedings.

According to ICE, many of the releases were mandatory, some as required by court cases—it mentions one—in which the Supreme Court held that the government cannot indefinitely detain an immigrant if there is "no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future."

Over the weekend, CIS experts postulated that Secretaries of State Hillary Clinton and John Kerry bear partial blame for some of the 36,007 criminal immigrants released last year, estimating that 3,000 releases were "mandatory"—due to the Supreme Court case—because of their apparent failure to invoke a statute requiring the DHS Secretary to request the Secretary of State to stop issuing visas to those countries that do not take back or delay taking their citizens back.

There is a total breakdown in the protection of this country and our borders when it comes to enforcing the law. There are some areas where the law is being enforced. There are some areas where Border Patrol is doing absolutely everything they physically can to enforce the law. But because the President's commitment is to having navigators as being more important than having Border Patrol, then we have a leaking sieve at our borders.

Because the Federal Government, this administration is more committed to having new IRS agents to enforce ObamaCare, agents, navigators, bureaucrats that will never so much as put a Band-Aid on a hurt, this administration considers them more important for health care than doctors, nurses, people that actually do good.

I have been hearing this last week in my district about doctors and nurses being laid off but bureaucrats being

hired right and left by the Federal Government, health care bureaucrats. They are not going to save a life. They are going to create more paperwork. They are going to create more burden for people that actually do the healing and treating. They are currently making their lives miserable with paperwork and with computer work.

Some doctors have already told me they were retired or retiring because they are just not going to be answering to bureaucrats that don't know about the treatment they provide. Yet this administration thinks more bureaucrats, more IRS agents, more navigators—who, by the way, we hear reports are getting voter registration forms to people that they are signing up. So, gee, they may not be providing health care, they may be providing misinformation about health care, they may be telling people to get on Web sites that don't work, but they are getting them registered to vote. How about that?

Mr. Speaker, look, it is time that the Federal Government, through the executive branch, started fulfilling their oaths to enforce the laws as they are. It is time that this Congress, like in the case of the PATRIOT Act and the so-called USA FREEDOM Act that is going to leave a gaping hole in the manner in which the Federal Government can continue to get personal information that has nothing to do with terrorism, it is time for all of us to step up to the plate and do our jobs and follow our oaths.

□ 2115

Once that is accomplished, there will be more jobs for people because the economy will improve. There will be more health care for people because we get more doctors and nurses and fewer bureaucrats. It is time we started living up to our commitment to the American people.

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the Special Order given tonight by Mr. HORSFORD of Nevada.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending the funeral of his father-in-law.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today and the balance of the week on account of family medical reasons.