

As we do these things, we will also address a fundamental problem that faces this Nation, which is climate change. This is real. I studied this in the 1990s, when I was Deputy Secretary of the Department of Interior, as we prepared the American agenda for the Kyoto climate conference. Unfortunately, the treaty that came back from that conference was never adopted by the Senate in the 1990s.

So to this day, we have yet to address this issue, and we must. This is an issue that will cause flooding across this Nation. It will cause sea levels to rise, which we are already seeing, and it will lead to more severe storms, which we are already seeing.

How can we do that? Again, back to the transportation bill, back to the water resources bill. Put together the levees that we need to protect ourselves, and put together the transportation systems that allow for increased public transportation, whether it is on a locomotive built by that German company in America, in Sacramento, which is the most modern locomotive in the United States, made in America 100 percent.

Maybe it is a streetcar or a fast rail system or a bus, again, financed by Americans, built by Americans with a Buy America proposal, our taxpayer money used to employ Americans as we build high-speed trains, as we build new locomotives, hybrid buses, or whatever.

That public transportation will lead to a reduction in greenhouse gases, and if we eliminate the congestion that is caused by our inadequate highway system, we also will reduce greenhouse gases, all of which is good for climate change.

□ 2000

There is much more to be said. But now for more than 3 years, I have stood on this floor and brought to this floor and to the attention of this Nation the Make It In America agenda, which is part of the transportation system as well as part of our highways and ports system. So we are going to continue with this.

The plea I have to my colleagues—435 of them, Democrats and Republicans—is that we learn from our success. The Water Resources and Reform Development Act was a success—a bipartisan success. It lays the foundation for the protection that we need from floods, as well as growing our economy on the rivers, locks, and the ports of America. It was a good one. We thank the President for his signature today. Step one.

Step two comes to us over the next 3 months as we face the highway cliff where we know that if we fail to enact a new highway bill, we will see 700,000 Americans unemployed, losing their jobs over the next year. We have to get this job done. The President has laid out a good proposal. We can tweak it, we can make changes to it, but we must take it up, and we must move forward with the transportation program.

And when we do, no more—no more bridges made in China, only bridges made in America, American taxpayer money spent in America for American steel and American workers.

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

THE DECLINE AND FALL OF GREAT CIVILIZATIONS

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, we have been going through appropriation bills, today Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development. We have had an open rule process where anybody who wanted to bring any amendment could do so. I was a little surprised that my amendment did not pass. It had 160 votes today. This is a very simple amendment. We took the last official number we could find from an executive branch, from January of 2009, before President Obama was sworn in, and it indicated that there was less than 1 percent of those getting section 8 public housing given to them, and so we took the amount of money clear back from 2009, even though there are indications that it is many times that now, we just took that conservative amount, trying to be conservative and trying to be more than fair, which it was, and said, okay, we have got to send a message to Housing and Urban Development folks that you can't just keep giving housing away.

I know the mainstream media never talks about it when there is a Democratic President, but they sure bring it right back up as soon as a Republican takes over the White House, and that is homelessness. Well, if homelessness is ever a problem, then why do we keep offering and paying for people to use federally financed housing when they are not legally getting federally financed housing?

So it gets me to use the word "only" with \$24 million, but it was only \$24 million that would be the amount reduced from section 8 public housing to send a message that, HUD, if you are going to be providing housing to people who are not legally allowed in public housing, then we are going to cut your funding by that much. It seemed like a pretty good amendment. It sent a message. And I was grateful for the numbers. The USA is very concerned about the illegal immigration issue. We scored that as an important vote, and we got 160 votes.

If we cannot, as a majority Republican Congress, muster a majority of votes to say to the rest of the country that we have an obligation in this generation not to spend future generations' money, not to continue to be the first generation in American history to put succeeding generations into so much debt they can never get out of

it—we have a moral obligation not to do that. It is absolutely immoral to be spending future generations' money. It is wrong, and if we can't even agree to cut public housing that is provided to people by the amount that was provided 5 years ago—illegally—then where are we ever going to make cuts?

It would be nice if America were strong enough to house and feed the entire world. But if we try to do that, we will be so devastated and emaciated as a country that we will become a Third World country, because you just can't do that. You go bankrupt, then people quit buying your products, and then you have an entire rebound situation. But that is how you can become a destitute country.

It is how the Soviet Union went out of business. It is what happens to any country, any group that tries to live under a communist or socialist system. As Margaret Thatcher said, eventually you run out of other people's money, and you are broke.

A true free market system does not fail. A free market system fails when it becomes more and more and more socialistic, more government controlled, more giveaways, less reward for one's own work, and more reward for not working at all. That brings down a nation under the rules of socialism because it cannot stand—not in this life. It cannot. Yet, this Congress, though we are Republican-controlled in the House, is continuing to fail to stand strongly enough to protect future generations. And it is heartbreaking.

Now, I got back from being in Nigeria for a couple of days. There are mothers with whom I met of young minor girls. Three of the girls were taken into captivity by Boko Haram, a radical Islamic group, and they were able to escape. There were only a handful that were able to do that, and this was three of those. Twenty-two of the mothers—one mother had two of her girls kidnapped.

Radical Islam, because of its desire for a global caliphate, is a threat to all freedom-loving people. It is a threat to moderate Muslims because they generally go to the top of the list. If they protest, then they are at the top of the list to be knocked off by the radical Islamists. But consistently at the top are Christians and Jews. So radical Islam is a threat to civilization as we know it.

The progress that was made in Muslim civilizations could not have been made if they were truly radical as we keep seeing them raise their ugly heads in Iran and places like Nigeria, the northern part where Boko Haram continues to terrorize, including yesterday. I am not for going to war, but we were able to go into Afghanistan when we knew Afghanistan was where the 9/11/2001 attack originated, and with less than 500 American soldiers, Special Forces and some intelligence, air cover, some weapons, they were wiped out within 4 or 5 months. It wasn't until we became occupiers with tens of

thousands of military in-country that we started running into real difficulty and loss of American lives.

Then this President came in and basically was ready to announce a date of withdrawal, which is considered by most warriors as an announcement of surrender. When you say, this is when we will withdraw no matter what is happening, most consider that as a declaration of surrender if they are opposing those who are going to withdraw.

So we could do that in places. We have done it in the Philippines. Send a little embedded help for the Nigerians to eliminate Boko Haram, take them out as a threat, and then don't become occupiers, don't nation-build, just help them take out anything that is a threat to civilization as we know it and our freedom and liberty as we love it.

It may shock some, Mr. Speaker, but in Nigeria these families have heard repeatedly that nobody cares about your daughters that were abducted and nobody cares what is happening. And if you think for a minute anybody from America cares, they are too busy enjoying their own lifestyle, they could care less what happens here. Nobody from America is coming.

One Congressman came, and there are more, there was another small group there, but I was the only one that met with family members. So they didn't know there was another group.

Again, it may shock some, but these families in Nigeria don't follow Twitter. They don't know what a hashtag is. So when the best an administration in the United States can do is #bringbackourgirls, it doesn't do anything for the families. They continue to cry day after day after day. One of these three girls was telling me that they had nightmares because they knew what was happening to the girls because of what happened to them while they were there, and they felt guilty because they were out and these girls were in.

When the superpower of the world doesn't seem to care about the rule of law, number one, and begins to reward our enemies, begins to penalize our allies, those three things—and I will add one more—and then fourth, spending massive amounts more of money than we take in, those four are a very good prescription for bringing about the end of a great nation.

Now, I am not a doom-and-gloom person, but I did major in history before I went—I knew I was going into the Army for 4 years, I loved history, especially American history, but anybody that studies world history understands that no nation will last forever—none. No nation will ever last forever in this life and in this world. So it is a question of how long you can maintain a great nation.

The Romans, as great as they were, couldn't make an empire last forever. Later, the Ottoman Empire took over all these nations, most of them surrounding the Mediterranean Sea. And

until the stop in Vienna, it looked like they were headed toward taking over all of Europe. They didn't last forever.

□ 2015

Going back before the Romans, the Greeks, they had a great empire. They didn't last forever. Ironically, some like to point to Alexander the Great and say: see, you can conquer Afghanistan and occupy it successfully.

I point out that Alexander the Great died leaving Afghanistan. I wouldn't consider that a great victory. It didn't work out that well. It didn't then. It didn't for the Russians. We have to be smarter about what we do because no Nation does last forever.

My goal in being in Congress—one of my goals—is to try to work with other Members of Congress to perpetuate this little experiment in democracy for another 200—maybe 100 to 200 years.

As Ben Franklin said:

It is a republic if you can keep it.

That takes work.

As Thomas Jefferson said:

The price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Our Nation seemed to grow more apathetic after World War II and has seen our deficits go through the roof. Countries around the world are now saying: You can't trust the dollar because Americans can't control their spending; they have no moral judgment which would keep them from spending their children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren's money, so we need to stop taking the dollar.

When the dollar ceases to be important international world currency, it will have a devastating effect, bring about a crash, most likely, here in the United States, and you will not be able to revive the economy by creating more and more and more money, day after day, as is currently happening in this country now and has been dramatically happening for some years, especially since 2008.

Nothing indicates to the world at large our lawlessness more than our refusal to enforce our immigration laws and to secure our borders. Some say: oh, you must not like Mexicans.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I think the Hispanic culture, with a love of God—generally speaking—a love of family, and hard work ethic can help reinvigorate our Nation's morality where it should be. My wife and I went for our honeymoon 36 years ago in Mexico. It was quite extraordinary. I have very fond memories.

What we have seen recently are not Mexicans coming across our border—no. The big numbers have been coming from further south. They have been coming from South America and south Latin America, south Central America.

In talking to a law enforcement officer in Texas, the pride of Governor Rick Perry, I was just told—talking in the cloakroom to Steve McGraw—they are not sure how many 12 and under are in these masses, but generally, it

doesn't look like there is a big percentage 12 and under.

Apparently, in the last 8 days, the first 8 days of June, it appears that they have dwarfed the massive thousands that have come into the U.S. in the whole month of May, and May was dramatically ratcheted up from the month before that, and it is continuing to grow larger and larger.

It was a bit appalling to hear a spokesman for the Obama administration is saying they have no idea why there is such a tremendous surge in the numbers of children coming into the United States.

I mean, for heaven's sake, when you send out an invitation saying "you all come," you shouldn't be surprised when they do.

When you basically send out notification to the world that, if you can come quickly, we will give you amnesty, and we will provide you housing, and we will give you welfare benefits, and we will give you education, and we will give you better hospital care than you have ever had, then I think you can expect a great—a dramatic increase in the numbers of people who send their children to America. It shouldn't be a mystery.

I have had great regard for the Anti-Defamation League. My understanding of their inception is basically to deal with hate, particularly as had been seen with anti-Semitism.

After studying about the Holocaust during World War II and studying about it in history—high school and college—I couldn't believe that we would ever see anti-Semitism, an anti-Jewish sentiment arise in America as it had around the world.

I didn't think we would see the rise of anti-Judaism in Europe again. I figured the Europeans would be too ashamed to ever allow that to happen, and yet we have seen it happen.

While the Anti-Defamation League has not done the best job of helping suppress the anti-Jewish sentiment growing in Europe and that some see growing here in America, as we see Middle Easterners like Iran saying they want to wipe out Israel as the Little Satan and the U.S. as the Great Satan, and when you read the pleading that the mastermind of the 9/11 attacks wrote in his comfortable cell at Guantanamo Bay and he talked about and quoted the Koran, in essence, as the basis for wanting to destroy all Jewish people and all Christian people, so that Jews and Christians are together, as far as the radical Islamists are concerned, we all need to be wiped out.

Instead, the Anti-Defamation League, this noble endeavor, sent this letter to me that was received last week:

Dear Representative Gohmert:

We write to urge you to stop using inflammatory rhetoric in the immigration debate. Your statements from the House floor that the current administration is "luring young children across the border" and that current policies are complicit in "helping lure people into sex trafficking" do not help engage in a

productive discussion about the salient issues surrounding the immigration challenges our country is experiencing. Immigration remains a deeply polarizing issue in American politics and public life.

Well, let me assuage concerns by the Anti-Defamation League, but the policies of this administration are luring young people—children—into this country, mainly being sent by adults, because of the policy of trying to create amnesty for children.

Anyone in Congress, Republican—and I know we have some—and Democrat who keep saying yes, any children that are here, we need to go in and give them amnesty, are helping to lure children.

I know they are not doing it intentionally, but they are doing it, and talking about amnesty for children is sending more and more children from South America and Latin America and other places, so they can get here in time for their amnesty.

I was told by a missionary about a billboard up with our President's face, encouraging sending children to America, and the word spreads like wildfire: America is going to give amnesty to any children that can get there.

Deeply troubling should be the fact that some children get tied in with sex trafficking and really despicable human traffickers—why? Because of this announced, discussed policy that we want to provide amnesty for children that are here.

There is an article from Breitbart today entitled, "Illegal Immigrants Intentionally Surrendering to Border Patrol to Gain Entry to U.S.," by Tony Lee.

Illegal immigrants are reportedly signaling Federal officials to detain them once they are near the U.S.-Mexico border, as Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials have declared they may not pursue all illegal immigrants who do not show up for hearings after they enter the country.

Mr. Speaker, if anybody in this administration thinks they don't hear that and that word does not get around to those who are tempted to send children to America, they are wrong. That word gets around: they are not going to send you back if you come.

According to the Los Angeles Times, Yoselin Ramos, an illegal immigrant from Guatemala who was with "20 other families with children," actually "had looked forward to being caught," telling the outlet "at one point even waving down Federal helicopters—because of the welcoming treatment they had assumed they would receive."

In their home countries south of the border, reports have been circulating that illegal immigrants, especially those with children, will be allowed to stay in the United States "indefinitely." Ramos said she decided to make the trek to the United States after hearing reports "that parents will not be detained in the U.S. if they arrive with a child."

The Federal Government has been sending illegal immigrants to States like Arizona and Oklahoma, and local officials do not even know where some of them are headed. And though illegal immigrants are required to show up to meet with local Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, officials

within 15 days, ICE official told the Times that "they couldn't guarantee they would pursue all cases in which immigrants do not show up for follow-up appointments, but would examine each case to determine priorities."

In fact, "ICE officials say that the immigrants are released as long as they can provide an address for their destination—with family or friends, no matter their legal status."

Ramos was sent to stay with her family in Iowa. And the Houston Chronicle reported that another illegal immigrant said he considered the papers ICE gave him to be a "permit" to remain in the United States. That illegal immigrant was sent to stay with family in North Carolina.

Though these illegal immigrants said they intended to show up at their hearings, there is no guarantee that ICE is willing or even has the resources to track them down if they do not show up.

This is from Judicial Watch from yesterday: "Influx of Illegal Alien Minors a Disaster: Overcrowded Shelters, Diseases, Sexually Active Teens."

It sure seems to be clear from the pictures we have been seeing that a very small percentage of the minors coming in would be below teenage years, but this story says:

The barrage of illegal immigrant minors entering U.S. through Mexico in recent weeks has created an out-of-control disaster with jam-packed holding centers, rampant diseases, and sexually active teenagers at a Nogales facility, according to information obtained by Judicial Watch from a Homeland Security source.

□ 2030

There was a liberal game plan laid out some years ago that indicated the way to bring down the United States, for those extreme liberal activists who wanted to do so, the hippy mentality, let's bring down the evil United States that was the freest country in the history of the world, they wanted to bring it down, destroy it. The part of the game plan for doing so in this well thought-out narrative, you overwhelm the system. You get so many people on welfare rolls, the government implodes. You bring so many people in, you lure them in, so much so that the country cannot take care of them, and it implodes.

My dear friend Joel Rosenberg has a good book I was reading recently, called, "Implosion." That is one way a nation can end its existence as a strong nation.

Another article from Newsmax, "Central America Newspapers Tout Open U.S. Door for Illegal Minors."

Mr. Speaker, for those in the administration that just cannot imagine what is causing the dramatic increase week after week, more and more and more coming to this country and overwhelming our Border Patrol's ability to handle the situation, then they just need to read a few newspaper articles. It's really quite telling.

This one by Todd Beaumont says:

Newspapers in El Salvador and Honduras are promoting policies by the Obama administration that defer deportation to minors brought to the United States as children by

their parents—known as "DREAMers"—and those that are housing illegal children at military bases in the South and West.

Almost all agree that a child who crossed the border illegally with their parents, or in search of a father or a better life, was not making an adult choice to break our laws, and should be treated differently than adult violators of the law." Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson is quoted in a story about a new 2-year extension of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Act published by Dario El Mundo in El Salvador.

Signed by President Barack Obama in 2012, the law grants temporary legal custody to many young illegal immigrants, ending the threat of deportation for at least 2 years.

The policy, however, does not entitle the immigrants to state services. The law was renewed for 2 more years. "With the renewal of DACA, we act according to our values and code of this great Nation," Johnson said. "But the biggest task of comprehensive immigration reform is yet to come."

Meanwhile, La Prensa of Honduras discusses in a report how as many as 500 illegal minors are being housed at the Naval Base Ventura County in southern California. "The children will be accommodated for between 3 and 4 months, while their parents or relatives are located in the United States," the report says.

"The administration of President Barack Obama has acknowledged he faces a serious crisis for the continuous arrival of children, mostly Central Americans, who are illegally entering the country on the border with Mexico." Besides Mexico and Honduras, the report notes that many of the children are coming from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

"During their stay, in addition to accommodations and food, the children receive English classes, play sports, and participate in targeted programs while immigration authorities contact their families," the La Prensa report says. On Monday, the Obama administration said it would begin housing as many as 1,200 illegal minors at the Army base in Fort Sill in Oklahoma.

And it goes on.

For anybody who could wonder why the numbers are increasing basically daily, weekly, dramatically increasing, so that potentially in the first 8 days of June they have already overshadowed the massive number that came in in May, and because this Nation is a caring and the most charitable nation in the history of the world—any time, any place—the most charitable nation in the world, the most welcoming of immigrants around the world to our country legally—no one comes close to the number of immigrants that we allow into this country annually, nobody. Legally, I am talking about. And yet they dare to criticize our immigration policy as not being open enough?

I still believe if the President or the Secretary of State notified the leaders in Mexico: Look, we turn around people that come in by mistake to the U.S. If they try to come in by mistake, we normally turn them around—that is until this administration's policy of just welcoming everybody, basically, particularly if they have got children. But if the President or Secretary of State added that we are about to start pushing the change of our laws in some respects to being like your immigration laws, so when an American citizen

cannot own property outright by themselves in Mexico, we are going to change our laws, because if it is good enough for you to treat United States citizens like this in your country, then it should be good enough for the United States to treat our—treat your Mexican visa holders the same way, so we are going to outlaw Mexican nationals owning property outright in America. But if you want to head off our beginning to have our immigration laws more reflective of your own laws treating us when we come in, then you better let our marine go, and you better not ever pull that again.

The man said he made a mistake. It was easy to make a mistake. I couldn't believe somebody could make a wrong turn and end up being unable to turn around, but then when you see Greta Van Susteren's video where she goes in, you have the concrete barriers, you can't turn around until you get there and say, "I made a mistake; I want turn around and go back," and they decide this is a great chance to grab an American soldier and throw him in jail.

It is a similar message that's being sent around the world by this administration doing nothing about our marine being falsely, wrongly held in jail. The same kind of message is going into Africa and into Afghanistan and into the Middle East and China and Russia and Crimea. And the message is: we don't even protect our own people, really. If we have a deserter, then we may give away five people that are destined to kill lots more Americans, but otherwise, we are not going to help a marine who really had served honorably. We are not going to help him, but we may help somebody who walked away from his post.

The message is going out and making America appear to be a joke. It is why some are pushing their nation like Putin, knowing he could take over the Crimea. And the U.S. Government might talk about it, they might do as they did and put a hashtag and Twitter something and then be shocked that the Russians weren't scared to continue on in their imperialistic landgrabs by this administration's Tweets.

What a shock. A man who learned manipulation and domination from the KGB appears to the world to be backing down a community organizer. What a shock.

The story from Breitbart written by Kristin Tate, "Border Children Reportedly Sickened by Food in U.S. Facilities, Throwing in Trash." It is from a Houston story.

A tidal wave of illegal immigrants along the U.S.-Mexico border has caused Federal housing and processing facilities to become overwhelmed and overcrowded.

The surge of thousands of children, it talks about. And so is it any surprise that more and more are coming to the extent we can't even provide them proper food?

Here is one from Townhall.com, "Internal Border Patrol Email: Unaccom-

panied Child Crisis is 'Unprecedented'"—Katie Pavlich. That is from today.

A story from Stephen Dinan of The Washington Times, "Holder Seeks Legal Team for Children on Border, Program to Aid 'Most Vulnerable.'"

A story from Breitbart—I am not sure that is an appropriate title—"Obama's Criminal Activity on Immigration." The story talks about:

With the wave of illegal immigrants crossing America's southern border thanks to the Obama administration's policy of non-enforcement, more and more Americans are rightfully anxious about the new and unprecedented use of executive power by President Obama. In December, U.S. District Judge Andrew Hanen of Brownsville, Texas, wrote, "[The government] has simply chosen not to enforce the United States' border security laws."

It was written by my friend Ben Shapiro.

Here is one, "Officials 'Overwhelmed' by Influx of Children Crossing Mexican Border into U.S. on Their Own."

It is very dramatic what has been going on, and there is a price to pay when we do not enforce our own laws, and we will pay by having more and more and more children coming into this country illegally.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's think about this. When people come into the U.S. and we fail to turn them around and say: You are not lawfully coming in, so you can't come in. We are not going allow you to come in illegally, so go back, go back from where you came. You were able to get here, so go back wherever you came from. When we refuse to do that and allow them to come on in anyway, then we end up providing food, shelter, supervision, education. Apparently, we are going to provide legal services now, according to this article discussing our contemptuous Attorney General Eric Holder, who has shown a pattern of refusing and failing to follow and enforce United States law.

□ 2045

It would seem that when you add up all the costs of those things, we would be better off—I had heard there was a plane with 100 and something minors that landed in the U.S. It seems it would be cheaper to just refuel their fuel tanks and send them back where they came from, sending a message with it: we are not letting people come in illegally. We already let more people in legally more than any Nation in the world, and we are not even one of the largest nations in the world.

You have got China with estimates between 1.3 and 1.8 billion. You got India that is nearly as big. We are a large Nation, but not nearly compared. We are about a fifth the size of China, a fourth the size maybe of India, yet we let in many more immigrants than they do.

So it is not that we have a ruthless immigration policy. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems, and I have had more and more reporters asking this question: So what

do you do? Well, you secure the border first. You don't seal it. I have never advocated that. People lie when they say I have ever said that. I have never said that. You don't seal the border. You secure the border so that we continue to allow over a million people a year legally to come in.

But anyone who is trying to come in illegally must be stopped, they must be stopped and be required to attempt entering legally because they will not be allowed to come in illegally.

Whatever adults are sending children, it would still be cheaper to put an ICE agent with a group that came from a place like the 113 and make sure they go back where they came from, because otherwise the radical liberal approach of overwhelming the system so you can bring it down is in full display right now on America's borders, overwhelming the spending so that our dollar is not worth what it was, overwhelming our ability to protect ourselves, dramatically cutting the military where we can't adequately defend ourselves and those who would be harmed immediately before we would be harmed. Because as President Bush used to say, it is a whole lot better to fight people in another country than have to fight them within our own country.

There are those who have compared Israel to the miner's canary; that if Israel is under attack, as they are every day, then the free world will be immediately behind it.

We have got to start being more lawful. As I asked somebody in one of our hearings on immigration before, why are people coming here? Well, they are coming here for jobs or for food or for opportunity. Well, no, that is not answering why they are coming here, because they wouldn't need to come here if the countries they were coming from had jobs and had opportunity. Obviously, they don't have the jobs and opportunity where they are coming from. So why are there more jobs or more opportunity here? The answer is, up until more recently, we have been a Nation of laws. Up until this administration, we abided by the Constitution as best we could.

Sometimes in our history the Constitution was misconstrued. It should have stood for freedom for all men and women throughout our history, but it took a Civil War and then an ordained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr., to see that rights were to be applied across the board.

But nonetheless, there was an effort throughout our history where Presidents were supposed to follow the law and have their administrations enforce the law. This Attorney General is in contempt of Congress because he is not.

It is time to take further action and send a message to the world that we are still a Nation of laws and believe in the rule of law, because until we do that we will be overwhelmed, and hopefully we can take a stand and require

the administration to follow the law before it is too late.

But it genuinely was heartbreaking to me. It is not angering but heartbreaking to hear the President of the United States say, if Congress doesn't act I will, indicating that he would usurp constitutional authority reserved for the legislature in the Constitution. He would usurp that. The response by most of my friends on this side of the aisle was to stand and applaud the announcement that the President would ignore the Constitution, and if Congress didn't change the law he would take care of it himself by himself.

To see people applaud the destruction of our Constitution was heartbreaking to me because I know they didn't realize they were applauding the implosion of our Constitution. There are an awful lot of good friends I have on the other side of the aisle who probably stood and applauded, and I am sure they didn't realize. But that is the effect when a President of the United States says if Congress doesn't address the law, change the law, then I will.

The result is what our Founders promised. It was a Republic as long as you tried to keep it. You did have liberty, but you ceased being vigilant so you lost it. I tried to warn you about all these things. We tried to warn you, as John Adams did, that this government is only meant for religious and moral people, and not fit to govern any others.

Abraham Lincoln, as inscribed on the inside wall on the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial in his inaugural address a month or so before he was assassinated, talked about God. Lincoln tried to debate in his inaugural address within himself how a good God could allow such suffering.

It comes down, it appears, from his theological dissertation, that when a nation acts wrongly, as this Nation did in allowing slavery, a just God would allow suffering as a result. To paraphrase Lincoln, if it be God's will that every drop of blood drawn by the master's lash also be drawn by the sword in war, then we still must say, as was said 3,000 years ago, the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous all together.

When we as a Nation ignore the law, when we as a Nation encourage other nations to ignore our law, when our Justice Department refuses to enforce the law fairly and justly across the board, you lose the country that was, has been, and hopefully for a while longer will be the greatest country in the history of the world.

We have an obligation, a moral obligation, to future generations not to leave this country the way we are about to. But people have got to wake up on both sides of the aisle. You can't keep announcing that we are going to ignore the law if you can just get here before we pass the law. We are looking the other way, come on, ignore our law along with our Justice Department, ig-

nore our law along with the Homeland Security Department, ignore our law along with the White House, come on, we will ignore our law together. It truly is a prescription for the end of the Nation. We can't let that happen. People have got to wake up.

So for those in the administration that just can't imagine why there is a dramatic increase in minors coming to our border, start reading some of the things you are saying and you will find the answer.

Mr. Speaker, we have an oath to follow. By God's grace let's follow it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEWIS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the afternoon of June 10.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 11, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

5891. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Idaho: Infrastructure Requirements of the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2012-0183; FRL-9911-09 Region 10] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5892. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California; San Joaquin Valley; Contingency Measures For the 1997 PM2.5 Standards [EPA-R09-OAR-2013-0534; FRL-9911-07 Region-9] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5893. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Illinois; Revision to the Chicago 8-Hour Ozone Maintenance Plan [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0274; FRL-9910-92 Region 5] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5894. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0269; FRL-9905-80] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5895. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Finding of Failure to Submit a Prevention of Significant Deterioration State Implementation Plan Revision for Particulate Matter Less Than 2.5 Micrometers (PM2.5); Arkansas [EPA-R06-OAR-2014-0380; FRL-9911-25 Region-6] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5896. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Oregon; Approval of Substitution for Transportation Control Measures [EPA-R10-OAR-2014-0139; FRL-9911-23 Region-10] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5897. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of States' Requests to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Volatility Standard in Florida, and the Raleigh-Durham-Chapel Hill and Greensboro/Winston-Salem/High Point Areas in North Carolina [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0787; FRL-9911-13-OAR] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5898. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Review of New Sources and Modifications in Indian Country — Amendments to the Federal Indian Country Minor New Source Review Rule [EPA-HQ-OAR-2003-0076; FRL-9909-78-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR25) received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5899. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina and Tennessee; Removal of Obsolete Regulations [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0813; FRL-9911-44 Region-4] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5900. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision of the Venting Prohibition for Specific Refrigerant Substitutes [EPA-HA-OAR-2012-0580; FRL-9911-42-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AM09) received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5901. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Regulations Limiting Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides [EPA-R01-OAR-2008-0446; A-1-FRL-9901-93 Region-1] received May 21, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5902. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Georgia; Redesignation of the Roma, Georgia, 1997 Annual Fine Particulate Matter Nonattainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0893; FRL9910-65 Region-4] received May 8, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5903. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental