

the late Earl Morgan, and brought in new ones, including Charles Garrett and Robert Turnage. Charles McComb, Jim Redgate, Don Evans, and Doug Marshal were also assistants under Tyler.

August, 1966, practices under Coach Tyler and staff seemed unique, even from the beginning. The level of organization, the level of excitement of over 100 young men coming out to join our team, and the professionalism and commitment to a strong work ethic and Christian principles were evident from the beginning.

There was also something else quite unique in the history of the football program. After the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Meridian, Mississippi, deep in the segregationist South, began to slowly integrate its public schools.

That first Tyler August of 1966, we were joined by James Williams, the first black athlete in the Wildcat football program's history. The following year, several more African Americans, including Robert Bell, a defensive tackle, joined us. Not very tall, but very wide and athletic, Bell proved to be quite immovable, and hitting him seemed like slamming into rebar filled with concrete. He went on to play for Mississippi State.

Our relatively unknown head coach then, Bob Tyler, led Meridian High to a fully undefeated season in his first year. The championship game was also quite unique in a couple of ways. Our opponent, the Jackson Provine Rams, still ran the old single-wing offense popular during the 1930s. The secret to Provine's success was high school coaches of the 1960s had no experience defending against the—even then—archaic style of football.

Bob Tyler had an old secret weapon, too, which was defensive line coach Earl Morgan, who played college football during the single-wing era. He knew exactly how to destroy it.

The other surprise of the game was a touchdown from the very first play of scrimmage when a "long bomb" was lobbed from Bob White to George Ranager. Meridian High won the game and the Big Eight championship, equivalent to today's 6-A championship.

The 1967 season under Tyler went much the same way. We had another perfect season, except for a tie game with Columbus. Nonetheless, we went to the State championship and defeated Biloxi High to make it two State championships in a row.

With such a sterling resume, Bob Tyler received considerable notice from colleges, as you can imagine. SEC coaches pursued him, and the great Johnny Vaught, head coach of Ole Miss, recruited Tyler to become assistant at Tyler's alma mater and favorite team ever.

It was rumored that Vaught was grooming Tyler to succeed him as head coach. Vaught ultimately retired with health problems, and Tyler left for the opportunity to coach under the leg-

endary Bear Bryant of the famed Crimson Tide. It wasn't long before Bob got his shot to become head coach of an SEC football team. He went on to Mississippi State, where he found great success during his 5-year tenure.

Bob Tyler was not only noted for his coaching, but for the talent he developed. Smylie Gebhart, a great defensive end, went on to become an All-American at Georgia Tech. David Bailey, a wide receiver, went on to set reception records under Bear Bryant. George Ranager caught the winning touchdown for Alabama in the famous 33-32 shootout with Ole Miss in 1969.

Coach Charles Garrett, Tyler's right-hand man, took the helm for the 1968 season and had big shoes to fill. With Tyler promoted to the SEC, Garrett proved he had what it takes. Meridian High School had a third undefeated regular season, but lost out in the State championship rematch against a very fast Biloxi High School team.

Garrett developed stars, too. In his 3 years as an Ole Miss running back, Greg Ainsworth ran for 1,361 yards and 17 touchdowns. Mac Barnes, Garrett's quarterback for the 1969 season, became a coaching star in his own right. He went on to coach Meridian High championship teams as well.

Mr. Speaker, though of mediocre athletic ability, I gained tremendously from my experience as a Meridian High Wildcat under both Bob Tyler, Charles Garrett, and their very able assistant coaches. Any achievements I have made in my life and career must be credited to a large extent to what I learned on the practice field—concepts such as personal discipline, commitment to excellence, personal sacrifice for a unified team goal, preparation for success, and the meaning of teamwork.

Morris Stamm said:

It is a commitment to a bigger goal, an opportunity for a young man to learn more than blocking and tackling.

Don May offered this:

My life lessons learned from the MHS football days proved positive. Hard work and dedication can enable an individual to accomplish any goal and achieve success throughout a lifetime. Applying those lessons to my career and personal relationships has helped me achieve things I would not have thought possible.

I now look forward, Mr. Speaker, to the scheduled gathering with many of my teammates and coaches of the Meridian High Wildcats who coached or played under Tyler during the football season of 1966 and 1967. Therefore, I now hereby declare the period of 1966 and 1967 to be the "Coach Bob Tyler Era."

What is likely to be our final roll call will be held on August 23, 2014, Meridian. Amazingly, most of the coaches and players, including Tyler himself, after nearly a half century, are still living and will attend the reunion.

Some have gone on to glory before us, however, and will miss that final roll call and we will miss them. They include coaches Earl Morgan and

Byron McMullen, as well as players such as Smylie Gebhart, David Bailey, Mike Cumberland, David Murray, Gary Saget, Maurice Ross, Mike Magee, Woodson Emmons, and possibly others.

Mr. Speaker, I now close with these words.

To a man, each of my brother Wildcats, I am sure, feel as I do that every moment of the hard work, sweat, pain, and sometimes disappointment was worth it, and we are all better men because of it. Such a common experience even a half century ago bonds us together forever. Indeed, we were then, as we are today, and always, even when we no longer answer that roll call, will be known as the Meridian High Wildcats, a true "band of brothers."

Mr. Speaker, today I want to express a heartfelt tribute to the leaders of our Wildcat band of brothers—Coaches Bob Tyler, Charles Garrett, and all Wildcat coaches, living and not, and to all of my brother players living and not—for all you have done for our town, our school, and especially for me.

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

□ 1930

AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM WITHIN A CONSTITUTIONAL RE- PUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 50 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and to take up these topics that I appreciate your attention to.

As the other Members disperse across this Hill and over to their offices and as their staffs are tuned in on television and for those who are here in person, we have got some serious issues to discuss. This country has been led down a path that has been, I think, in the end, destructive to our Republic, and it is important that we focus on these issues that are getting out of hand.

We are a great country. For the Fourth of July, I sent out a tweet that morning to celebrate the Fourth of July: "Happy Independence Day."

The United States of America is the unchallenged greatest nation in the world, and we derive our strength from Western civilization, Judeo Christianity, and free enterprise capitalism. There are many other components to those three parts that I mentioned. Of course, as I send out that message, there are those who disagree.

First, they don't think of America as an exceptional nation. They don't believe in American exceptionalism. Our President makes the statement that: oh, yes, I believe in American exceptionalism in the way the British believe in British exceptionalism and

the Greeks believe in Greek exceptionalism.

That is an entirely different concept. There are many countries out there that are proud of who they are, and they should be. They are proud of their nationalities. They are proud of the history of who they are. Borders, culture, and language are what tie a country together.

The other countries that see themselves as such and are proud to be so, as the British and as the Greeks are, are not like the United States of America. They do have borders, they do have culture, they do have language, but none of them were formed around an ideal, an ideal of God-given liberty.

None of them were formed around the idea of the rule of law. None of them have a bill of rights like we have a Bill of Rights, where you can look at the pillars of American exceptionalism and read most of them as you read down through the first 10 amendments, our Bill of Rights.

Pillars of American exceptionalism: freedom of speech, religion, the press, and the right to peaceably assemble and petition the government for the redress of grievances—there are four pillars in one, in the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

The right to keep and bear arms is another pillar of American exceptionalism. Whatever our pain is as the result of people who are dying due to gun violence—and if I counted the casualties right, in Chicago, over the Fourth of July weekend, it was 14 murdered and 82 wounded in gun violence. It is a product of lawless people who are violating gun laws.

They don't respect their gun laws, but we have the right to keep and bear arms because it is an obligation to keep our society in a position where we can defend against tyranny; yet some don't understand that. They think, somehow, the Second Amendment is about having the right to defend ourselves or the right to hunt or the right to collect or the right to target shoot.

All of those things are ancillary benefits that come along with the Second Amendment, and they are necessary so that we continue the culture of respect for arms and gun safety, but the real reason that we have the right to keep and bear arms is to defend against tyranny.

So far, we haven't seen a tyrant emerge in America who has brought about the need to utilize our Second Amendment, to defend ourselves from a tyrant who would lord over us and our God-given liberty.

Now, history moves on, and different personalities emerge, so I couldn't rule that out for the future, and I couldn't rule it out, actually, for the current either, Mr. Speaker.

With all of these pillars of American exceptionalism—the First Amendment, the Second Amendment, the property rights that used to exist with utter clarity in the Fifth Amendment, but, because of the Kelo decision, have been

somewhat eroded—and along through our protection against double jeopardy and a quick and speedy trial and a right to face a jury of our peers and the powers of the Federal Government that devolve down to the States or the people respectively in the Ninth and 10th Amendments—we couldn't have built a country without these.

We couldn't have built a great country, Mr. Speaker, if we didn't have that foundation that I mentioned in the beginning—if we didn't have the core of Western civilization that emerged here on this continent at the dawn of the industrial revolution, if we didn't have the age of reason that accompanied old English common law, which is a descendant of Roman law, which is a descendant of Mosaic law—if we hadn't had those pieces, America would have never been, just as if we were not a Judeo-Christian nation, with a sense of morality and a sense of justice, a sense of forgiveness, a sense of redemption—yes, and a sense of confession.

If we hadn't had those pieces that are part and parcel of our culture and our civilization, America would have never been. We wouldn't have held together, and we wouldn't have been formed in the first place, so we wouldn't have sustained ourselves through all of these trials and tribulations of the centuries in the 238 years since the founding of our Republic.

That is how important this country is; yet we have many who don't understand this, many who refuse to believe the reality of history that has brought us to this point, many who don't respect this reality of history.

When I say that our Founding Fathers were almost universally of a solid faith—in fact, of a solid Christian faith—I hear from the other side of the aisle over here that: no, they were deists, they really had a different way of looking at this.

Thomas Jefferson a deist? Go look at the memorial. You will find more references to God in the Jefferson Memorial than you will see as typos in there, and there are two typos.

Thomas Jefferson was a moral and a religious man, and it anchored much of what he did as was true for all of our Founders. They were not atheists, they were not agnostics, they were not deists. They were rooted in a strong faith and a deep understanding of history, and they understood the flow of history.

On one of my trips out here to Washington—before I came here, Mr. Speaker, to serve in this Congress—I went to the National Archives. There was a long line waiting to see the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, which are on display underneath glass at the Archives today—8 inches of glass in between there and 8 inches of.

It is that Declaration of Independence in which our Founding Fathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor. As I waited to walk through there to see the original docu-

ments—for me, it was the first time—I read through the display that was at the National Archives. This was a display of artifacts from the Greek city-state era.

There, I learned with the real examples before me of how the Greek city-states had the purist form of democracy, at least at the time, and that men of age had an opportunity to speak and to have their voices heard with their votes in the Greek city-states, but they had a problem with this pure form of democracy, and our Founding Fathers understood this.

They learned that, if it is just the masses, if the majority can rule over the minority and if there are no foundational or fundamental rights, then it is the tyranny of the majority that rules over the minority.

There was also the tyranny of the demagogues, the demagogues that had perfected their artful oratory in such a way that they could move the masses in an emotional way, often against the best interests of the Greek city-states.

When a demagogue emerged who drove the city-state in a direction that wasn't prudent, but was emotional and put the city-state at risk, then they had the Greek blackball system. The blackball system was that they would all line up to vote. There would be a gourd here or a piece of pottery here that had a little neck in it and enough room to contain all of the marbles, and there was a discard pottery as well.

When the Greeks decided they were going to see if they were going to banish a demagogue from the city-state, each one of those in the city-state who could vote—each one of these adult males—got a white marble and a black marble in his hand.

As they walked through—one of these potteries was the voting one, and the other one was a discard, and no one could tell whether they voted to keep this demagogue in our city-state by voting white or to banish this demagogue from our city-state by voting black.

It was maybe 100, maybe 1,000, or however many were there to vote in the Greek city-state—maybe several thousand. As they walked through, if three of them voted a blackball in the voting pottery—in that voting container—and discarded their marbles in the other one, if only three of them said banish this demagogue from the city-state, they would banish him for 7 years because he was a poisonous influence on their civilization, on their culture, and on their society.

That was one of the ways they held in check this raw, pure democracy that existed back during the Greek era, and our Founding Fathers understood that.

They understood also that these pure democracies had a way of essentially imploding and expiring. They understood that they had a limited lifespan—they thought, perhaps, a couple hundred years, so they didn't devise a democracy, Mr. Speaker. America was not devised to be a democracy.

As a matter of fact, you can take a look here in this Constitution and read in here that it guarantees a republican form of government. That is a representative form of government. It is not that everybody goes to the city center—to the coliseum—and votes on national policy.

We had that proposal, by the way. Let's see. We had a Presidential candidate from Texas who pledged that we should actually go on the Internet and all vote these policies, so America could become close to a pure democracy. I didn't like that. I thought that that was a bad idea.

Our Founding Fathers had a bright idea. It was a good, solid, principled idea: give us a republican form of government.

When Benjamin Franklin walked out of the Constitutional Convention, a lady there asked him: What have you given us? His answer was: A republic, ma'am, if you can keep it.

The Republic is a representative form of government where you elect Representatives to come to the House and be reelected or not every 2 years and go to the United States Senate for 6-year terms, with the idea that we would be a quick reaction force here in the House and of a longer-term view, maybe a little cooling effect, over in the Senate, with the balance of these two bodies.

In article I of our Constitution, the most powerful and influential component of our three branches of government is Congress—the United States Congress. That is why it is article I. All legislative power exists here between the House and the Senate.

In article I, the legislative powers of the United States Government are here—here, Mr. Speaker, in this House and over at the other end of the Capitol building, which is through the rotunda—over to the United States Senate—all legislative powers, article I.

Our Founding Fathers started, when they drafted the Constitution, with article I because our power comes from God, and it is granted to those of us who represent this government from the people—of, by, and for the people of the United States.

Their powers that they derived from God are transferred here into this Congress, so that we can express their will and bring forth the policies that they believe are the best and most prudent for the United States of America. It isn't just our being a reactionary force—a barometer, a taking of the temperature of our constituents—and somehow come here and reflect that in national policy. That is not exactly the definition of our job, Mr. Speaker.

Here is what I owe my constituents—and I would entreat all of my colleagues to adopt this policy and philosophy—I owe everyone whom I have the honor and privilege to represent my best effort and my best judgment.

My best judgment includes be home; be among the people whom I have the privilege to represent; listen, listen,

listen; take into account their concerns, their dreams, their aspirations, their grievances; and bring that back here with the best ideas that have emerged from that and couple with that the things that I am able to have the time to pay attention to on policy to analyze because I have the privilege to represent a lot of constituents who work for a living.

They are busy. They turn in 50, 60, 70, 80, or more hours a week. They do that to take care of their families. They do that to build a nest egg. They do that to prepare for their futures and, perhaps, for their retirements. They do that to build the capital so that they can reinvest, which creates jobs and increases the standard of living.

The people I have the privilege to represent are busy. They don't have time to spend 60, 70, 80 hours a week paying attention to public policy, but they do have time to pay attention to whether I am paying attention to public policy.

That is my pledge: my best effort and my best judgment, including incorporating all of their best judgments into the things that I can do and all of the other things that I have the opportunity to learn.

If I find myself at odds with the constituents in my district, it is time to have an eye-to-eye, heart-to-heart conversation. I should do what is right for God and country and State and district—in that order.

I have never found a conflict between that order of priority. When my mother was alive, I had told her: Mom, if there is a policy that is not so great for you, but that is right for America, sorry, but we are going to do what is right for America, and we are going to find another way to take care of you, Mom.

That is the way we need to do business in this country. We need to look to the long-term best interests of the United States of America.

We need to look back in our rearview mirror and say: How did we get here? What made us this great Nation? What were the principles that our predecessors adhered to that became such a foundational rock that we could be this unchallenged, greatest nation in the world? What were they? What are they? What are they that exist today? What are those principles that are being eroded, so that America isn't as strong in some of these areas as we used to be?

□ 1945

Do we still have this freedom of speech?

Well, maybe not quite, Mr. Speaker. And I say maybe not quite because this freedom of speech that used to compel us to utter the things that we believed to be true is now restrained by the political correctness, the political correctness where a CEO of a major corporation donated \$1,000 to support a man or woman joined together in, hopefully, holy matrimony, and loses his job as a CEO because there are peo-

ple that believe that marriage is something other than between a man and a woman.

That is not what you call a free speech. That erodes us all when you see that happen.

When you see the attacks that come—and I see them come primarily from the left. There will be people that will take issue with the tone of remarks or the word choices of remarks, but they aren't so much aggrieved by the actual function of what we are describing.

For example, there are people that don't like the way some of us talk about abortion. They don't like to be reminded that I and millions of Americans believe that human life is sacred in all of its forms, that it begins at a moment, and that is the moment of conception, and it needs to be protected with that great reverence for that sacred unique human life created in God's image from every moment of its conception until natural death. They don't like that kind of dialogue. You will never see a video of an actual abortion performed because the very sight of it is so appalling that the other side would object to the freedom of speech to demonstrate such a thing.

They don't like the idea that we call illegal immigrants "illegal immigrants." They don't like the idea that they get labeled as "illegal aliens" or "criminal aliens," but never mind that this is actually the legal term for those who are breaking our immigration laws.

Mr. Speaker, you will know that one of the top topics that we are faced with, as we went back to the Fourth of July, as we go across this country, is the immigration issue. It is in front of us now again.

It is not a new experience for a lot of us. We were at this topic at this time last year. We went through this debate in 2005, 2006, and 2007 before it finally died away and we bought a little bit more time to come back and revere and respect the rule of law again. But it has been so eroded.

Wherever I go, the immigration topic comes up, Mr. Speaker. And we are watching the video now of the images of people coming across the border, many of them at McAllen, Texas.

Now, I would take people back to what we have experienced in the past in that intense immigration debate that took place, started when President George W. Bush gave his amnesty speech, his comprehensive immigration reform speech.

My memory says that it was January 5, 2004. It was the launch of his reelection campaign. It was a calculation that he needed to reach out to the Hispanic community and, therefore, calculated that if he would grant some form of amnesty and start the process of legalizing people that are here illegally, that somehow they would embrace him as a Presidential candidate.

I think it was an overreaction to what they saw happen in the year 2000

when George W. Bush and Al Gore ran against each other, and when they got down to the recount in Florida, with 537 votes being the deciding difference between who would be the President of the United States and who would drift off into history, that election, I believe, they looked at the county-by-county election returns on which counties went for George Bush and which counties went for Al Gore and saw, I believe, what I know I saw, Mr. Speaker. It was the blue, southern tip of Texas. South Texas went for Al Gore.

Now, how could it be that a Presidential candidate of the stature of George W. Bush, a favorite son of Texas, a Governor of Texas, could lose such a big chunk of Texas on a county-by-county basis to Al Gore? I think they drew a conclusion that it was the Hispanic vote that he had not done very well with in Texas and decided this is how we are going to do better with the Hispanic vote, and so they turned it up.

They announced, after George W. Bush was reelected in 2004, that George W. Bush had carried 44 percent of the Hispanic electorate. But, upon further analysis, by the time you slice and dice and take that formula apart and put it back together, it comes down to an objective analysis that it couldn't have been 44 percent. It had to have fallen between 38 and 40 percent. Whatever that real number is, I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't 44.

But we then saw JOHN MCCAIN, who was long known as an "open borders" JOHN MCCAIN, run for President, and he picked up 31 percent of the Hispanic vote. So 7 percent—or 8 or maybe as much as 9 percent—of the Hispanic vote was lost between George W. Bush and JOHN MCCAIN. It never was 44. If it was, it was even a lot more. Then it was 13. But I am going to say instead that I will pick that number at 39 and say that JOHN MCCAIN watched an 8 percent drop in the Hispanic vote from George W. Bush's high watermark, where he reached out in a very positive and proactive way, down to JOHN MCCAIN at 31 percent.

Four years later, for the reelect of Barack Obama, Presidential candidate Mitt Romney came forward and he garnered 27 percent of the Hispanic vote. That is really not disputed. So he dropped 4 percent from the 31 percent of JOHN MCCAIN, the "open borders" JOHN MCCAIN, to 27 percent for Mitt Romney.

What happened, Mr. Speaker?

We ended up with an autopsy report that said that somehow it was a calamity, a free fall, a loss of a big chunk of the Hispanic vote because Mitt Romney had said a couple of words that seemingly allegedly had offended people, those two words being "self-deport."

Now, if the language is so sensitive that you can't use a term like "self-deport" without losing the Presidency, how in the world, Mr. Speaker, are we going to enforce the law? How are we

going to reinforce the respect for the rule of law if we can't, in a delicate way, say, you know, if we really do enforce the law, a lot of people will decide that they don't have a legal presence here and they might decide they are happier if they would wake up in their home country. Somehow that is offensive to people?

Instead, I would say there has been a loss in the Hispanic vote, certainly not from 44 percent for George W. Bush but from, say, 39 percent down to JOHN MCCAIN. That is an 8 percent loss—31 percent for JOHN MCCAIN, 8 percent loss. Only a 4 percent drop from that down to Mitt Romney. Who knows which direction that is going to go, but it completely disregards, Mr. Speaker, the tens of millions of dollars that Democrats spent calling Republicans racists and getting a return on their investment by watching that be an effective, however sinful tactic it is.

I have watched this for a number of election cycles. I have watched it in my own race.

When you pit people against each other, Mr. Speaker, when you identify people and say you are in one class here, you are in another class here, you are in a group here, you are in a group over here—and the Democrats know. They will sort you out. They will say, well, your hair is blonde and your eyes are blue, so you belong here; and yours is dark and your eyes are brown, you belong over here; and you have a melanin content in your skin, and I am going to put you there.

We are all created in God's image, every one of us, and He has given us the distinction so we can tell each other apart. For us to identify those distinctions that are God-given identifying characteristics and use those to categorize people as something different than other people for political gain, Mr. Speaker, I believe is a sin. It is against the interests of this country, and we have fallen prey to those kind of tactics, and we have a President who falls prey to those kind of tactics.

I would remind you, when you had Officer Crowley and Professor Gates and that instance in Cambridge, Massachusetts, when the President jumped in on what looked like was a home burglary circumstance, upon review, Officer Crowley conducted himself just fine; Professor Gates got a little bit out of control. The President jumped in on something he never should have weighed in on and concluded that, because the professor was of one skin color and the officer was of Irish descent, that somehow there had to be some kind of racism involved rather than the humanity of an officer who puts his life on the line to bring our safety to us and to protect and preserve the rule of law. So the President, to get out of that deal, had to have a beer summit at the White House.

Well, that lasted a little while, until Arizona passed its S.B. 1070 law, which is their immigration law that was designed to exactly mirror Federal law—

not exceed it, not go beyond it, but exactly mirror Federal law. And what happened? The President weighs in and says, well, you know, if are you a mother, a Hispanic mother taking your daughter out for ice cream, you could potentially be pulled over and checked for your papers. That was a statement that brought a focus on to race and ethnicity, and the law specifically prohibits such a thing, but he brought race into this equation again.

Now we have a President who has two of his family members who have received some form of amnesty, his Auntie Onyango and Uncle Omar. Auntie Onyango has now passed away, but she lived in public housing for a long time on the government dole. She was adjudicated for deportation at least once, perhaps more times than that. The President's presence in this country and hers in this country got her an amnesty.

So did drunken Omar, President Obama's uncle, who nearly ran over a police officer up in that same neighborhood and received his form of amnesty, too, because, after all, if you send him back to Kenya and he happens to be related to the President, somebody will kidnap him and maybe he becomes held hostage for profit. So we surely couldn't send somebody back, no matter how many times they had been adjudicated for deportation, no matter how much they were on the government dole, no matter what kind of an unexemplary citizen—well, a resident of the United States. I have to retract that citizen piece. A resident of the United States.

Illegal immigrants, the President's uncle, the President's aunt, they get asylum. They get amnesty. And the President reaches out and says, essentially to the world, we are not going to enforce immigration law. It is a progression on his part.

It was Bill Clinton that did the most deportations. In the year 2000, he had more deportations than anybody in history, before or since, more than George W. Bush, more than Ronald Reagan, more than George H.W. Bush. But those high deportations that took place under Bill Clinton diminished substantially under this President. They diminished under George W. Bush. They diminished again substantially under this President.

Mr. Speaker, this President has put the welcome mat out. He has essentially advertised to people in foreign countries: if you can get into America, you get to stay in America. That has been his policy. While they will announce that he has more deportations than anybody else, it wasn't true the moment they uttered that. It is not true today. The President has confessed that they count differently than any other administration.

We have a circumstance on the southern border that adopts involuntary return. If someone sneaks into America and they are caught at the border, they are offered a couple of options.

One of them is, well, today, we will take your prints and your picture. But if you will voluntarily return to your home country, then you will not be barred from coming back into the United States on either a 3- or a 10-year bar. That is the deal. So a lot of them take that voluntary return and go back to Mexico and try again.

In fact, we checked the records down at Nogales at the border station, and this was several years ago. They had a single individual that had attempted to come into the United States and had been caught 27 times. No penalty. Here are your prints. We will take your picture. We will send you back to Mexico. You can go. Sometimes they come back in the same day and they are caught again the same day.

We had testimony before the Judiciary Committee in the Immigration Subcommittee where the Border Patrol came before us, and I asked them: What percentage of illegal immigrants do you interdict, do you stop at the border? Their testimony said, well, perhaps 25 percent. Well, 25 percent is an abysmally low number, Mr. Speaker. Only 25 percent interdiction at the border.

Now, I go down to the border and I ask them down there, the Border Patrol, Customs, Border Patrol and ICE: What percentage are you interdicting here at the border? Are you getting—are you stopping 25 percent? They would laugh and say 10 percent has to come first. Ten percent was the most consistent number that I heard, sector after sector, agent after agent. They think they are stopping about 10 percent. One of the ICE supervisors said: I think it is 2 to 3 percent.

So this 25 percent number, even if we accept it, then you have to multiply it times four to come up with the number of people that are coming across our border. If we stop 25 percent, that means 25 people come across, there is really 100 of them. When you do the math, at the peak of our interdictions, which was during the Bush administration, that came to about 11,000 a night, 11,000 illegal aliens, criminal aliens coming into the United States across our southern border every night.

That traffic has slowed down a little bit because there are fewer economic opportunities. So that 11,000 was about twice the size of Santa Anna's army. Now the nightly border traffic is about exactly the size of Santa Anna's army.

Now, of course, they aren't all armed. In fact, very few of them are. But we are watching what is going on in McAllen as we are watching tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors come into the United States.

□ 2000

And that number was predicted more than 6 months ago by Chris Crane, the president of the ICE union, who has said, we are going to see more than 50,000—I believe the number he gave was actually 60,000—unaccompanied minors coming into the United States

in the next year. Well, we have already crossed over 50,000. And for this full year, we are going to see that number—July, August, September—and that number is increasing. We think in the next fiscal year, it is predicted that it will be 120,000, not this 50,000 that we have crossed so far.

And, by the way, these unaccompanied minors, these are kids under the age of 18. These unaccompanied minors represent about 20 percent of the illegal aliens that are coming into America. And those are the ones that we catch.

So that is 100,000. Perhaps that number, approaching 120,000 illegal aliens that they catch, it is a number bigger than that. We have got a number that goes to some 300,000 criminal aliens to be interdicted in this fiscal year, and I think that number will go higher. That is one of those snapshot estimates. I am going to predict that it is going to be closer to 600,000.

But still, this President has refused to send people back. If you come into the United States, if you are able to set a foot in the United States, get into America, if you get into the interior, you are almost home-free. If you are not caught at the border, you are almost home free.

But something less than 2 percent of those who come into the United States who are interdicted, who get caught, are actually sent back home. And now, when you slice and dice that number down, you see the trend: that is going down to something like 0.1 percent that are faced with the enforcement of the law against them.

This is the wholesale destruction of the rule of law, Mr. Speaker. The wholesale destruction of the rule of law. This is a President who has rolled out the welcome mat and has sent the message across the continent, across the hemisphere and, actually, the world: if you can get into America, we aren't going to bother to remove you from America.

He has prohibited local law enforcement from enforcing Federal immigration law. He has gone to court to enforce such a thing. They have canceled 287(g) agreements, which are cooperative agreements between political subdivisions and the Federal Government so that local government could help enforce immigration law. He has sent his Attorney General hither and yon to file lawsuits against political subdivisions that simply want to enforce the rule of law and reflect Federal immigration law.

There is no other law that I know in this country that doesn't ask for, receive, and appreciate the full cooperation of all levels of law enforcement, whether they are city police, county sheriffs, whether they are State officers, criminal investigation personnel, or Federal officers of any kind. All levels cooperate at all levels, with the exception of immigration law, which has been carved out to be separate by this President.

And now we have a President that a year ago last summer, in the middle of the summer, some time in July, introduced what we call the DACA language, or the Morton Memos. And those memos are written in a bit of a—let's say a deft, convoluted, legalistic way, signed by John Morton, presented by Janet Napolitano. I promised her that she would be sued over them, and she is.

But these Morton Memos create four different classes of people. They grant an effective de facto. That is, they grant an amnesty to people that are in the United States. And it is the idea that if you came into America, and you were under the age of 18, you weren't responsible for your actions.

Some people on my side of the aisle will argue that you can't form intent if you are young. If you are too young to form an intent, then you can't be held accountable for breaking the law. I would point out, how young is that? Because a 2-year-old who reaches their hand in the cookie jar in my house knows that is wrong. And if you holler at them and say, Johnny, they will hide that cookie behind them and act like they didn't do anything wrong. You can't convince me that a 17-year-old can't form an intent when a 2-year-old can at the cookie jar and know it is wrong.

But this President somehow believes that if you came into this country before you were 18 years old, or at least say you did, that it was through no fault of your own that somehow your parents brought you in. And now, we have 50,000 kids from countries other than Mexico—Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras—who are being pushed up into the United States of America, who are attracted to come here. Why? Because of the powerful magnet of no enforcement of the law, no effective enforcement of the law here in the United States. The magnet of family members that have already been beneficiaries of no enforcement of the law.

We had a case that was decided in December of 2013. I introduced it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the Judiciary Committee a couple of weeks ago. An illegal alien mother in Virginia had abandoned her 10-year-old daughter in Guatemala. She had hired a human smuggling coyote to smuggle her 10-year-old daughter across Mexico into the United States. They were supposed to deliver this child to this illegal home in Virginia. They were caught at the border. The human smuggler had charges brought against her. She had been in trouble for this same kind of activity in the past. So they brought charges for trafficking and human smuggling against the coyote, the human coyote. But the 10-year-old girl, what did she do with her? They loaded her up—she is an illegal alien, too—and delivered her up to Virginia, to her illegal alien mother into a household full of illegal aliens. ICE completed the crime. Immigration and Customs Enforcement completed the crime.

And when the judge rendered his decision on the prosecution of the human trafficker, he wrote that he had had a case like that in each preceding week in the previous month, at least four of those similar cases where ICE had completed the crime of human trafficking and had delivered this child—which may or may not be the daughter of the resident of the illegal household in Virginia—delivered this child into that household.

Now, that message went out, Mr. Speaker, all over Central America: If you are from somewhere other than Mexico, send your children to America. And they are coming across. They are climbing up on trains. They are riding that dangerous track. Some of them are walking. All of them are subject to being victims of the drug cartels and the violence. And yes, they are leaving violent countries.

The violent death rate in Guatemala, according to a Web site that tracks that, is 74.9 violent deaths per 100,000. The U.S. violent death rate is 6.5 per 100,000. That will tell you about the ratio of how much more dangerous it is in a place like Guatemala. Honduras, according to the United Nations report that just came out a few months ago, has the highest murder rate in the world, with 92 homicides per 100,000. But their numbers have grown in the last couple of years. They don't show the violent deaths rates as being that high.

But we do know by the U.N. records that eight of the 10 most violent countries in the world are in the Western Hemisphere. They are in Central America or northern South America, not Mexico.

America's violent death rate is 6.5 per 100,000. Mexico's violent death rate is 18.2 per 100,000. It is not quite three times that of the United States. But still, if you think of a country that has triple the violent death rate, and you send a lot of their young men here, there are going to be people in this country that die as a result of those decisions. And I am not picking on Mexico because it is far more violent south of Mexico, multiple times more violent south of Mexico.

In Honduras, there are 92 homicides per 100,000, compared to Mexico's 18.2. In Guatemala, the rate is 74.9 in violent deaths, not homicides. And in El Salvador, some years you don't get records because it is so violent there.

However, when you look at those countries and the homicide rates that they have, only Honduras has a higher violent death rate than Detroit. We should put this in perspective, Mr. Speaker. If we are going to move kids out of Central America to the United States of America because they live in a violent society, we dare not send them to Detroit because we would be putting them in an environment that is more dangerous than the one they left. But if you look at the universe of unaccompanied minors, let alone those who are accompanied coming into America

that are getting this Presidential de facto asylum, you will see a reflection of what showed up in the Guatemala newspaper here a couple of weeks ago, a Spanish language newspaper, interpreted to say thus: 80 percent of the unaccompanied minors are male; 83 percent of the unaccompanied minors are the ages of 15, 16, or 17. When they turn 18, they are no longer an unaccompanied minor—15, 16, or 17.

Mr. Speaker, I would challenge anyone to go anywhere in the world and identify a demographic group of people that are more likely to become gangbangers, to be violent, to perpetrate and prey upon innocence, than those that come from the most violent societies in the world. Eight of the 10 most violent societies in the world are south of Mexico, and they are coming here as OTMs, "other than Mexicans."

If you pick 15-, 16-, and 17-year-olds from the most violent societies in the world and you drop them into another society by the tens of thousands and perhaps substantially more than that, there isn't any rational person that would think that there aren't going to be victims in the United States as a result of this policy.

And yet, the policy that I talked about, that had ICE completing the crime of hauling the 10-year-old illegal alien to Virginia to be rejoined with her illegal alien mother in Virginia, completing the crime, that has happened dozens or scores of times until now.

So now the President has his administration that is doing this thousands of times. They are taking these unaccompanied minors, housing them, coming through McAllen, in particular, but a lot of other places as well, putting them in temporary warehouses, loading them on buses and hauling them to places where they can process them. And then picking them up and, if they have a phone number in their pocket, some of them have a phone number memorized, wherever they say a relative or an extended family lives, ICE, or now Health and Human Services, delivers them there.

They pull up in front of a household. It might be a crack house. It might be a meth house. It might be a gangbanger's house. This is the address. They slide the door of the van open. Boom, out you go, you 17-year-old unaccompanied minor that we don't have a provision where we can deport you back to your home country. Let's see if we can get you to be a productive member of society by dropping you in this environment.

There are no checks and balances on this. There is no prudence to this. And, in fact, the ones younger than 14, they are not even printed. They don't have their fingerprints taken. They don't have their pictures taken. We don't know who they are. And about 50 percent of them were not born in a hospital so they don't have a birth certificate. They don't have a legal existence in their home country. There is not a

way to track them. We don't know who we are handing them over to. We don't know who they are. We don't know if we pick them up next week or next year or 10 years from now if they actually were somebody that was processed through a warehouse in McAllen. These kids cannot be spread across this society in this fashion and infused across the illegal households in America. You grow more lawlessness, more lawlessness.

We are not relieving the pain and suffering. It is the parents that have abandoned their children. It is the parents that have endangered their children.

There was a little child in my district about 3 years old, a little girl who walked out of her house during the day. Her mother was working in the packing plant at night, and she needed to sleep during the day.

Yes, I trusted her mother was an immigrant—legal or illegal, I don't know. But this little girl wandered down the street several blocks. And somebody found this little girl and picked her up. And they looked around and asked questions and finally found out that, well, she came from this house where this mother was sleeping. So our Department of Human Services, our Iowa HHS, sat this mother down and said, this can't continue. You have got to care for this child. You can't let this child wander off on the street. Even while you are sleeping during the day—she needed to because she was working at night. But the child could not be left to wander because it is child endangerment. It is child abandonment. And they told this mother, you take care of your child, or we will take your child and put your child into foster care. And if you don't shape up, we will put this child into adoption so this child has a real chance in life.

We do not tolerate people who abandon or endanger their children in Iowa, and I don't believe we do that in any other State in this Union.

But the people who send their children across 1,000 miles of Mexico on the death train, exposed to drug cartels and human trafficking and the kind of slavery and exploitation that takes place on the victims that are coming up here, the parents who sent them along that path, they have abandoned their children. They have endangered their children. Over 1,000 miles of Mexico, not a few blocks down the street in a little safe Iowa town; 1,000 miles in Mexico.

□ 2015

And we, this great, benevolent Obama administration, will pick these children up and deliver them anywhere in America that they want to go because they have a phone number in their pocket, or an address that they memorized, and pull the van up in front of the crack house, open the sliding door and say, okay, here you are, fend for yourself? We should never put those children back in a household, an illegal household, never back into a law-violating environment.

These kids need to go home. There is another solution if we can't send them home. But putting them in these illegal households is not the right thing to do.

The President can solve this problem. Mr. Speaker, this is all in the President's head. The President sent out the advertisement that we are not going to enforce immigration law against you. He sent out the advertising that this government will take care of you, that we will make sure that you are living in a house where you have heat subsidy, rent subsidy, where you have food stamps, where you get an education, where you have health care, all paid for by somebody else, the sweat of somebody else's brow. And, by the way, now he wants \$3.7 billion from Congress so he can hire every one of them a lawyer. Give them ObamaCare and hire them a lawyer, and now they will have everything that is the dream of every American—your own lawyer, your own government-issued health insurance policy, a rent subsidy, a heat subsidy, oh, and an Obama phone. Who wouldn't come to America if they believe all that is true? That is what this President is doing.

If he needed a place to put these kids back to their home countries, we have a bill. In fact, I have a bill here, and I will include it for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

H.R. _____

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Keeping Families Together Act of 2014".

SEC. 2. REPATRIATION OF UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.

Section 235(a) of the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (8 U.S.C. 1232) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", or in the case that a child's country of nationality or of last habitual residence cannot be determined, safely removed to a country described in paragraph (6)";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the heading to read as follows: "RULES FOR UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN";

(B) in subparagraph (A), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "who is a national or habitual resident of a country that is contiguous with the United States";

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by inserting before the period the following: ", or in the case that the child's country of nationality or of last habitual residence cannot be determined, remove such child to another country described in paragraph (6)"; and

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by amending the heading to read as follows: "AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES";

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "countries contiguous to the United States" and inserting the following "any foreign country that the Secretary determines appropriate";

(iii) in clause (i), by inserting after "last habitual residence" the following: "or removed to a country described in paragraph (6)";

(iv) in clause (ii)—

(I) by inserting after "last habitual residence" the following: "or removed to a country described in paragraph (6)";

(II) by striking "and" at the end;

(V) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv); and

(vi) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(iii) subject to clauses (i) and (ii), a child shall be returned to the child's country of nationality or of last habitual residence, or in the case that the child's country of nationality or of last habitual residence cannot be determined, removed to a country described in paragraph (6) not later than 5 days after a determination is made under paragraph (4) that the child meets the criteria listed in subparagraph (A); and";

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking "48 hours" and inserting "10 days";

(B) by inserting after "last habitual residence," the following: "or removing the child to a country described in paragraph (6).";

(C) by striking "or if no determination can be made within 48 hours of apprehension,"; and

(D) by inserting at the end the following: "If no determination can be made within 10 days of apprehension, the child shall be treated as though the child meets the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)."

(4) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting after "last habitual residence," the following: "and the safe and sustainable removal of unaccompanied alien children to countries described in paragraph (6).";

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting after "repatriate" the following: "or remove";

(C) in subparagraph (C)(iii), by inserting after "last habitual residence," the following: "or safely and humanely removed to a country described in paragraph (6)."; and

(D) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ", except for an unaccompanied alien child from a contiguous country subject to the exceptions under subsection (a).", and inserting "who does not meet the criteria listed in paragraph (2)(A)"; and

(ii) in clause (i), by inserting before the semicolon the following: "not later than 5 days after the Secretary of Homeland Security makes the determination to seek removal of the child"; and

(5) by inserting at the end the following:

"(6) COUNTRY TO WHICH AN UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD MAY BE REMOVED DESCRIBED.—A country is described in this paragraph if—

"(A) the government of the country will accept an unaccompanied alien child into that country; and

"(B) the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, determines that—

"(i) there is no credible evidence that the child is at risk of being trafficked in the country; and

"(ii) there is no credible evidence that the child will be persecuted in that country."

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the title of the bill is the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, an amendment to it, and it addresses this topic. The topic is how we reach an agreement with the countries that are noncontiguous like Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras; just to be able to get an agreement to send their children back to their home country.

We can maybe direct this out of Congress if you get HARRY REID to go along

with it, Mr. Speaker, but the President can do this on his own. All he needs to do is call up the president of any one of those three countries and say that you need to be on the tarmac in, say, Guatemala City airport; I am sending a planeload of your unaccompanied minors back. You repatriate them back into your country and your society. If you don't do that, we are going to freeze up the foreign aid, and we are going to freeze up the trade. We are not going to be subsidizing a country that won't cooperate and sends their children up here for us to put on the public dole.

The President can solve this thing. It wouldn't take one day to solve this. It has taken him 5½ years to create this problem. It is the President's problem. The President refuses to solve it. He just wants more money to expand government and hire more lawyers and more judges, but he has no intention of resolving this.

He is going to infuse tens of thousands—in the end hundreds of thousands—of people into America in an effort to turn Texas blue, to do what the Bush administration feared would happen if they didn't do that outreach in the first place.

I don't believe we should do identity politics. I think we should reach out to everybody and say that you are created in God's image, that is good enough for me. You are one of us if you want to work and earn your way, if you want to pay some taxes and carry your share of the load, because when you shoulder that harness, you make the load lighter for everyone else, and you increase the average per capita GDP of our people. When that happens, we all live better. But there are 104.1 million Americans of working age who are simply not in the workforce.

That is going in the wrong direction. And the last thing we need to do is have tens of millions of unskilled and especially illiterate people who are going to compete for the lowest skills jobs. This country is going exactly in the wrong direction. We need a President who will move this country in the right direction. The President can fix this problem he created. He can fix it. This Congress probably can't force the President to fix the problem, but the bill that I have just filed into the RECORD takes us a ways along that, Mr. Speaker, and judging from the time, I appreciate your attention.

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

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE RESEARCH INVESTMENT

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a very interesting 1 hour on an issue that is important, and