types of investment in infrastructure, and it is a project that deserves our attention. It is a project that would provide significant money for highways. In his proposal, he would create 15 million jobs over the next 10 years for investment in many different kinds of infrastructure.

He has something that I have talked about here on the floor now for 7 years. We call it Make It In America, Buy America, use our tax money to buy American-made products, bring our manufacturing back. If you are going to use rebar to rebuild that spillway, then use American steel. If you are going to put a pump in this dam to drain some facility, buy an American pump. After all, it is our taxpayers' money. It is my money. It is your money. Use the Buy America principle.

He has a couple of other principles that I think are very important. He wants protections for American workers, and this is both life and health and safety protections but also wage protection, the Davis-Bacon and the prevailing wage programs, all of which I think pull up the bottom with good working wages for men and women in the construction industry. Also, make sure that there is an opportunity for minority- and women-owned businesses, and of course the environmental protection. These are kind of the principles of his program, which I happen to think are appropriate.

So what would he spend the money on? He would suggest that we spend $210 billion repairing the roads and bridges. Now, remember, that is about one-quarter of what the Department of Transportation said is needed for the backlog, but, nonetheless, that is a good start. For roads and bridges, $210 billion over the 10-year period. That is 1.3 million new jobs.

He would also want to spend $110 billion for new water and sewer systems. Not bad when you talk about places like Flint, Michigan, and the contaminated water in their water supply. In our own Central Valley of California, we have numerous communities that have inadequate water and, in many cases, water that is contaminated with various chemicals, both natural and from the business environment.

Senator SCHUMER suggests that we spend $180 billion to expand and replace our rail and bus systems. That is more than just the transit programs. I suppose that is to make sure that the Union Pacific bridges don't collapse.

He would also have $200 billion for vital infrastructure projects. These would be the most critical, the high-priority projects across the Nation. I would suggest to the Senator, Mr. Speaker, that the Senator might consider rebuilding the spillways on the Oroville Dam.

He would also invest $75 billion on American schools so that our schools are new and modern and meet the needs of our students, another $70 billion on the ports. Remember, I was talking about this earlier, about the ports that are inadequate. This feeds back to what Mr. DEFAZIO has suggested, that we have the harbor maintenance fund. These are fees that are collected on every good that arrives or every container that arrives at our ports, and that money be spent on the ports, both in the water as well as on the dock.

That money, unfortunately, is not spent just there. It winds up in the Treasury for who knows what purpose. So we would bring that money back to spend on our ports, modernizing them. Keep in mind that Panama, the new Panama Canal, has been expanded, bigger ships, deeper draft, so we need to dredge these ports, we need to build the wharves, the docks that can handle them.

Senator SCHUMER would also recommend that $100 billion be spent in energy infrastructure to meet the needs of a modern energy system that is not dependent upon coal and oil but, rather, renewable sources of all kinds. And broadband, which is exceedingly important. In my district, which stretches 200 miles up the Sacramento Valley, broadband is not available. So these are infrastructure investments that I would think all of us should agree on, that we need to build a modern infrastructure for a modern economy and a growing economy, and along the way create as many as 13 million jobs to do that, a project that would go forward over the 10-year period ahead of us.

So we have got the President suggesting a trillion dollar program, public-private partnerships, of which I suspect there are some right there, we have got Mr. DEFAZIO with a financing program for highways and transit systems and ports, and we have Senator SCHUMER on the other side with a trillion dollar program that would deal with virtually every part of the infrastructure, from broadband communications to ports, highways, bridges, and the like.

So we have, I think, an opportunity here in this Congress to address a critical need for America's future, not only for the safety of Americans so that all Americans can avoid the kind of catastrophe that California came very, very close to having on Sunday, with the collapse of a 30-foot dam on Lake Oroville, creating not this, but something that would be several times bigger than this cascading down the river and inundating communities to the depth of 100 feet or more.

It doesn't have to happen. We should never be penny-wise and pound-foolish. We should never delay these infrastructure investments because we know that bridges will collapse, and along with it the transportation system.

□ 1815

We know that dams are in jeopardy. We know that our highways are filled with potholes. We know that many of our airports are ancient and, in many cases, decrepit and certainly not up to modern safety standards and certainly passenger convenience. We know that our ports need to be dredged and new wharfs and docks built. We know that we need to have intermodal systems so that we can efficiently move cargo from the ports to the trucks, to the trains, and across the country.

We know the needs. The question for all of us is: Are we ready to meet those needs?

I would suggest to you that we can. We can do creative financing, as Mr. DEFAZIO has suggested. There is a role for public-private partnerships in all of this, as the President has suggested. There is also a place in all of this for us to make choices about how we spend the taxpayers' money.

This is one that I want to bring to the attention of Americans. We are in the process of making a choice to spend $1 trillion over the next 20 years or so to rebuild our entire nuclear arsenal. All of it. All of our nuclear bombs, all of the ICBMs in the silos in the upper Midwest, new submarines with new intercontinental missiles with new bombs on top of those missiles, new stealth bombers such as the new B–21, new cruise missiles with new bombs. All of these things. New, fast, stealthy, unobservable, extraordinarily dangerous because the rules of the old Cold War or the old nuclear standoff don't apply.

One trillion dollars for what purpose?

We need to ask that question and we need to make choices. There are many other choices that we will be making here. Choices about building a $30 billion wall rather than repairing the bridges, in this case to Canada. Choices about nuclear weapons.

Our job—your representatives here in Congress—is to make choices that are wise, choices that protect you, choices that give all of us an opportunity to have good, well-paying jobs, a modern infrastructure on which the private sector can then grow and prosper, and men and women can earn a good middle class living.

Or we can make choices on things that really do not provide any of those benefits. It is about choices. It is about being prepared for tomorrow. It is about avoiding collapsed bridges and reservoirs that might fail and send a cascade of water down upon the communities.

So I ask my colleagues to consider, to ponder the needs of your communities, and to make choices that are wise, that look to the future, and build a solid foundation that won't fail when that 30 feet of water presses up against that foundation. Choices. I hope and I pray we make wise choices.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had a resignation now that seems to be the big news of the day of a Cabinet member of the Trump administration.

It is interesting to have seen this Indivisible movement arise. The Daily Signal points out: '' . . . Ties to George Soros, Sows Division Against Trump, GOP Lawmakers.''

''Democrats who used to work on Capitol Hill are helping to disrupt Republican lawmakers' town hall meetings across the country through a nationwide effort to oppose and 'resist' President Donald Trump's agenda.''

And it goes on to talk about some of the leftists who are trying to do that.

And another article that says that the Indivisible team is trying to mimic strategies of the Tea Party. But it was quite a difference. The Taxed Enough Already Party was grabbing hold of American principles, constitutional principles, principles that brought about the revolution and served the country well for over 200 years; and that we are supposed to have a government that works for us, not works us; takes away our religious freedom, tries to take away Second Amendment freedom, tries to take away freedom of religion; tells us we can't say anything negative about anything they care about or they will try to destroy us, our business. And there were people that were shocked. And then on top of it all, add a lot more tax. And as the President told Joe the Plumber, in essence: We need to take your income and spread it around the country.

I had some friends here during the inauguration. I took them to the Lincoln Memorial. And, of course, on the south inside wall is the Gettysburg Address. On the inside of the north wall is the second inaugural that is so profound. Mark Levin's father has a terrific book about it. What an amazing speech.

Lincoln is talking just shortly before his assassination. But the second inaugural, the war is winding down, it is about over, and there is so much hope abounding. He was not bitter. He was an amazing man, our first Republican President. He talked about the Nation and about how both the north and south both read the same Bible and both pray to the same God. He points out that the prayers of both could not be answered, the prayers of neither have been fully answered. But he points out that it might seem strange that a group of people would invoke God's name to wrench their bread out of the sweat of other people's brow.

But I heard enough from people in the Taxed Enough Already Party, this group that arose that—wait a minute—basically are saying when the President says, I am going to take your money that you made and spread it around, he is basically saying, Look, I am going to be the most powerful man in the world, and certainly in this country, and my principles dictate; I need to take what you work for and spread it around to other people.

Is that a way of wrenching your bread from the sweat of others?

It is interesting. But anyway, this group had 17 show up at an office. Obviously, they were more interested in publicity than a meeting, because all they had to do is call and we make sure they have a meeting and somebody is there to meet them, even though I am here in Washington when they demand to meet.

Apparently groups all over the country are following this Soros-funded effort to try to destroy the country, disrupt the country, and create anarchy and mayhem wherever they can. Fortunately, in east Texas, people realize we can't quite go as far as some groups do because nobody would accept it. I have got some constituents that are asking legitimate questions.

But what we go back to is what really gave strength to this movement, objecting to what was being done in the Obama administration, was when we had a President and a Speaker who were saying: We know that a majority of Americans don't want this ObamaCare, Affordable Care Act. It is hard to call it affordable care because it is such a misnomer. But we see the polls. A majority of the American people don't want it, but we are going to stick you with it anyway because it is part of our agenda.

That is what was really bothering people. The thing is that this so-called Indivisible and groups like this are terrific at coming up with names that are anathema to what they really are. So you have a group called Indivisible, and their goal is completely dividing and destroying the constitutional principles of America.

But the thing is, a majority didn't want ObamaCare passed. It was shoved down their throats, even though most of the people in this body here had not even read it. I read it. It scared me. I am still asking for answers.

Why did President Obama need a commissioned and noncommissioned Presidential officer corps that he could call up. Initially, it sounded like a medical emergency group, but then it said they would be trained. It didn't say with weapons or with what. And it said the President would be able to call them up for any international emergency, and it didn't mention the word ''health'' or ''medical'' on that.

So, anyway, there is just so much in there that we didn't need. Most of Americans didn't want it and didn't like it. And it took away people's health insurance from them.

I was talking with thousands of people in my district. I love to do telephone townhalls with my district. This was one segment. About a third of the district last night was represented in this group, and I will have others coming up in the future. But it is very helpful to me because I can talk to people that you wouldn't see, you wouldn't hear, wouldn't see or hear you if you had 40 people come to a townhall, like sometimes do.

And since we know that there are groups out there that have instructions to create mayhem, disrupt, accuse them of racism—it is in the documents that we are seeing—whatever they bring up, charge racism, corruption, and something else, we can have a telephone townhall and I can find out what people are thinking that I otherwise wouldn't hear from.

I thought about doing a mailer to mail to as many in my district that I could, but the costs were just so dramatic. I could do it, but why spend $100,000-plus of taxpayer dollars just to find out what my district is thinking?

I think the best indication of what people in each congressional district in the country are thinking is what happened in the November election. That is the ultimate poll that anybody could ever take. And I have having been talking about for 6 years that ObamaCare needed to be repealed, that it takes away choice, that it is costing more money. You don't get to keep your doctor, you don't get to keep your insurance policy; and so many thousands in my district did not.

□ 1830

And so it was very helpful to hear from people, for example, how many believe the government needs to be more involved in health insurance, and I think that was at like 97 percent. There were thousands of people that had been called. But anyway, it gives me feedback.

It was interesting to note that this group, this indivisible group, the websites had gotten some information about the messages going back and forth, and one of them is, when we demand that they have a townhall that we can disrupt and they say we are going to have a telephone townhall because we can reach a lot more people, people that are invalids or homebound, seniors that couldn't get out to a personal townhall meeting can participate in the telephone townhall. They are saying how do we respond to that when there are so many more people they can reach and hear from and it helps the disabled to do these telephone townhalls, how do we respond to that? And they really didn't get a good answer, last I saw.

But it is important for every Representative to know where their district stands, where their people stand, and I continue to believe that I am the most fortunate Member of this 435-seat body because of whom I get to represent.

I had an opponent last year raising Cain about I was on national media so much, and I mean, when I think about it, why would national media want me to be on? It is certainly not my looks, certainly not because I have such an incredible voice.

You know, I would love to have a voice like James Earl Jones, or I was just so moved at the Senate Chaplain speaking at the National Prayer Breakfast a couple of weeks ago. I would love to have a voice like I think maybe God's voice may sound like

some day when I get to hear it, but I don't. I don't have a voice like that. This is what I have got. I don't put on any airs.

Why would any national media want to have me on? And I think it would have to have something to do with the fact that I represent extraordinary people in Texas where sense is very common, just so much common sense, and I think a lot of the country likes hearing about the way three-fourths of my district thinks. I think I reflect that district, and that is why, basically, three-fourths of the district voted for me. It is not because of the way I look or sound.

Even people that can't stand me in that 25 or 26 percent, they know I am going to stand up and do what I told people I am going to do. It is just that some people don't like it. Some years back, one guy wrote that I was a moron and misspelled ''moron.'' If he is listening, Mr. Speaker, he needs to know there is no E in moron.

But in any event, it is interesting to see how frantic things have gotten and how destructive some of the forces in this country have gotten in trying to bring down the principles that made us great, and it is quite disconcerting.

That leads me to a point I want to discuss, which we had the news, the tragic failing of the dam in California. We will continue, those of us who believe in the power of prayer, to pray that there will be no loss of life, despite the negligence of the California government in refusing for over 12 years—apparently, at least 12 years—to heed the warnings that this dam was going to be failing at some point. They needed to do something. We just need to pray that the negligence that occurred in the New Orleans area in diverting money away from shoring up the levee would not end up having the mass cost of loss of life in California.

But as we continue to have people try to disrupt our congressional districts, continue to try to make so much noise, create so much anarchy that it creates an inability to govern properly—despite the fact it isn't going to work—this President, this administration, and this Congress is not going to be diverted from what needs to be done.

This article came out today from the Free Beacon, by Adam Kredo: ''Former Obama Officials, Loyalists Waged Secret Campaign to Oust Flynn.''

Now, I hadn't known Flynn before. I don't believe I had met him before maybe last September. I might have, but I don't believe I have before that. But I had a chance to visit with him at that point with, at that time, Donald Trump, now our President. He is an interesting man. He has served his country well.

But there are issues that are coming out now about discussions with Russians. It would seem to me, if President Trump had an intelligence community and had people in the government service around him, the career people that were really wanting to help the country—rather than the Democrats or President Obama as he went out—that were really interested in helping the best interests of the United States of America, they would want the President to have all of the information that anyone in any of the upper echelons or anywhere in the departments that work for President Trump—wouldn't they want their boss to know or have the most accurate information?

Apparently, there was information out there that didn't come to light until President Trump had selected his National Security Adviser. He had been sworn in as the National Security Adviser, and they were on a roll. And of course, one of the things General Flynn was concerned about, something that is a deep concern of so many of ours in this body, was the outrageous Iran treaty that got treated like it wasn't a treaty. It was, indeed, a treaty. It never got ratified by the Senate, but it was, indeed, a treaty. It had all of the things in it that treaties would have.

But this article goes on: ''The abrupt resignation Monday evening of White House national security adviser Michael Flynn is the culmination of a secret, months-long campaign by former Obama administration confidantes to handicap President Donald Trump's national security apparatus and preserve the nuclear deal with Iran, according to multiple sources both in and out of the White House who described to the Washington Free Beacon a behind-the-scenes effort by these officials to plant a series of damaging stories about Flynn in the national media.

''The effort, said to include former Obama administration adviser Ben Rhodes—the architect of a separate White House effort to create what he described as a pro-Iran echo chamber—included a small task force of Obama loyalists who deluged media outlets with stories aimed at eroding Flynn's credibility, multiple sources revealed.

''The operation primarily focused on discrediting Flynn, an opponent of the Iran nuclear deal, in order to handicap the Trump administration's efforts to disclose secret details of the nuclear deal with Iran that had been long hidden by the Obama administration.''

Mr. Speaker, I want to insert here, some of us went down to the classified area of the SCIF where we can review classified information and we reviewed what was available about the Iran deal, but we found out there was a lot of secret stuff that the administration would not allow us to know: what he had given away, what he had done, potential bad judgment in going so far out of the Obama administration's way to placate and assist the largest supporters of terrorism in the world.

Obviously, what this article is talking about, some secret parts of the agreement, those are things that we were certainly not allowed to read no matter who you were in Congress at the time.

But this says: ''Insiders familiar with the anti-Flynn campaign told the Free Beacon that these Obama loyalists plotted in the months before Trump's inauguration to establish a set of roadblocks before Trump's national security team, which includes several prominent opponents of diplomacy with Iran. The Free Beacon first reported on this effort in January.

''Sources who spoke to the Free Beacon requested anonymity in order to speak freely about the situation and avoid interfering with the White House's official narrative about Flynn, which centers on his failure to adequately inform the president about a series of phone calls with Russian officials.

''Flynn took credit for his missteps regarding these phone calls in a brief statement released late Monday evening. Trump administration officials subsequently stated that Flynn's efforts to mislead the president and vice president about his contacts with Russia could not be tolerated.

''However, multiple sources closely involved in the situation pointed to a larger, more secretive campaign aimed at discrediting Flynn and undermining the Trump White House.

'''It's undeniable that the campaign to discredit Flynn was well underway before Inauguration Day, with a very troublesome and politicized series of leaks designed to undermine him,' said one veteran national security adviser with close ties to the White House team. 'This pattern reminds me of the lead up to the Iran deal, and probably features the same cast of characters.'''

And we know from news that has come out since the Iran deal was made by this administration, we know that some of the same placaters that enabled North Korea to develop nuclear weapons in the Clinton administration were involved in negotiating this deal with Iran. The deal with North Korea was to stop them from getting nuclear weapons, and so my interpretation of the deal was basically this:

They promised them: We will give you everything you need to develop nuclear weapons in North Korea if you will just sign a piece of paper that says you won't do that.

The Clinton administration, some of the same people that ran to do a deal with Iran, they jumped on that. And so what happens, North Korea uses what we provided them to help create nuclear weapons. Big shock.

So it is a big shock that the Obama administration would send at least one of those original people to be the top negotiator with Secretary of State John Kerry, who never saw a Genghis Khan that he couldn't work with, and they work out a deal. We still haven't found out all of the arrangements, all of the things that were done; but we know that there is, apparently, something so sinister about what this country has done, bent over backwards to provide for Iran or allow Iran to do, that the Obama administration could

not allow right-thinking American people to know what it had done for Iran and against Israel and the United States' best interests.

But if you believe the best interests of the United States are to weaken the United States, if you believe that the United States has been the biggest problem in the world for the last 100 years, then you would think, well, then if we make a deal with Iran that weakens the United States, may even lead to our demise, the world is a better place. So it is ultimately for the good of the world because the United States is certainly weaker than it has been in decades, going back to pre-World War II military strength.

The Chinese economy, it was announced at one point, may have exceeded ours. I am not sure that is true.

□ 1845

Anyway, countries around the world that are threats to world peace have gotten stronger. ISIS has gotten stronger during this President's term, in fact, came into being under President Obama and got quite strong, thousands upon thousands of lives lost.

In Afghanistan, he took a war that he told people—the voters in 2008—was the important war. And what should have been just a housekeeping operation under his leadership and with his rules of engagement, it cost about four times more American military lives than were lost in the height of the Afghan war for 7½ years under President Bush. It must be something in the leadership there when one President loses four times more military members than the prior President in the same length of time and the latter President being when the war was supposed to be basically over.

This article points out that:

''Flynn had been preparing to publicize many of the details about the nuclear deal that had been intentionally hidden by the Obama administration as part of its effort to garner support for the deal, these sources said.

''Flynn is now 'gone before anybody can see what happened' with these secret agreements, said the second insider close to Flynn and the White House.

''Sources in and out of the White House are concerned that the campaign against Flynn will be extended to other prominent figures in the Trump administration.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, I can inject here: Whoever these sources are that are concerned the campaign against Flynn be extended to other prominent figures, I can guarantee them that people in and outside the United States Government right now, as I speak, will do everything within their power—some of these characters will—to prevent President Trump from getting us back on track to making the world a safer place, to getting Iran back in the little box that President Carter let them out of. They are going to go after lots of people. It is not going to be limited. This apparently is a campaign that is going to be ongoing.

Apparently, General Flynn messed up and wasn't completely honest when he should have been. A President has got to be able to trust his security adviser. That kind of goes without saying. The President has to be able to trust those people.

It takes me back to September when I was talking—it was right before General Flynn walked up, actually ironically. But I was telling: Look, I like President George W. Bush. He is a good man. He is a smart guy. He is a lot smarter than people give him credit. He is one of the wittiest people you can ever have a conversation with, but something that hurt him—and I wanted Donald Trump to understand this—something that hurt him was that he was such a nice guy. After the election was over, he made it known, in essence, that everything that happened in the past is bygones. What is happening now, from now on, we are going forward.

The trouble is he had people doing bad acts, even crimes like having FBI files at the White House. Chuck Colson went to prison a year and a half for having one. The Clinton administration had nearly a thousand; nobody did a day.

I said, you have got to clean out these departments, these agencies where Bush didn't clean them out. You have got to or they are going to undermine you the whole time you are President. And it looks like we are seeing that right now.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just encourage all my colleagues to let's give the Trump administration the chance to help get this country safer, freer, and just a better place to live. It is not going to happen while people are undermining the President from within his own administration and a little cabal that has those ties in this administration. It is time to clean house, and General Flynn is not who I am talking about.

I yield back the balance of my time.

FROM DESEGREGATION TO RESEGREGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on May 17, 1954, Chief Justice Earl Warren delivered the shock that was felt across the Nation.

This was done when, on behalf of a unanimous Supreme Court, he announced:

''We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal.''

These 24 words, Mr. Speaker, had a far-reaching impact upon our Nation. These words ushered in an era of de jure desegregation that has changed the course of history that has created a new sense of destiny, and literally these 24 words opened doors that were closed to many persons and created new opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, before I go on, let me thank the many cosponsors of H. Res. 79, which recognizes the significance of Black History Month, and H. Res. 17, which honors the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the NAACP, on its 108th anniversary. I thank the many cosponsors and the many persons who have worked on these issues.

I have a staff that has worked tirelessly to make sure that we have these resolutions prepared, such that they could be filed timely. I am grateful to my staff. One such staff member is with me tonight. My legislative director, Ms. Amena Ross, is in the Chamber with me. I am appreciative that on Valentine's Day she has chosen to be here as opposed to where she probably could be and will probably be going shortly.

Mr. Speaker, given that in this month, the month of February, we celebrate Black history as well as the founding of the NAACP, I think that it is appropriate for me to speak on the topic from desegregation to resegregation. Mr. Speaker, it can happen.

Mr. Speaker, while Brown v. Board of Education has not produced the utopian society many hoped for—it has not ended the de facto segregation that many prayed for. It has not engendered the quality education for all children and has not transformed public schools into perfect schools or equal schools—I still contend and firmly believe that we are a much better nation with Brown v. Board of Education than without it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is important for us to give empirical evidence of these words that I have just spoken, my positions, if you will. I would like to do so by allowing the words of a Southern judge. I would like to allow his words to speak for themselves.

This is a message that was delivered by a Southern judge on October 4 of 1957. Mr. Speaker, I shall not call his name. I do not want to embarrass his family. But he was the vice president of a bar association. He was a circuit court judge. He received his BA from a prestigious institution, and he taught sociology.

Mr. Speaker, please hear now his words so that people may understand why Brown v. Board of Education was so important to so many in this country. These are his words:

''Segregation in the South is a way of life. It is the means whereby we live in social peace, order and security.''

Mr. Speaker, I trust that many people can understand why persons of my generation are concerned when we hear the terms ''law'' and ''order,'' terms that indicate law enforcement will take law into its own hands by some standards. In fact, there was law and order at the Edmond Pettus Bridge on