

are forced to report their activities to the Iranian Government. Protestant Christians are also viewed unfavorably by the Iranian regime. Furthermore, converts from Islam face particularly harsh consequences, as they can be charged with blasphemy or even face charges from revolutionary courts for political crimes.

These countries are all listed by the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom as tier 1 countries of particular concern, meaning they are the worst perpetrators of religious freedom. However, the Secretary of State has not officially recognized either Egypt or Iraq as a country of particular concern, likely due to the United States' security interests in both of those countries, as a designation would carry the likelihood of sanctions.

Madam Speaker, many of my constituents and I are gravely concerned about the plight of Christians as religious minorities in these countries and the role the U.S. plays in aiding them.

Madam Speaker, "If you want a friend, be a friend." This notion applies directly to the situation at hand. Religious freedom and human rights concerns have long been at the back of the line in U.S. foreign policy decisions, and it may be time to rethink our approach. We have continually supported regimes that are unfriendly to their people, religious and ethnic groups, and even the United States.

Madam Speaker, if we are going to support foreign governments with equipment and funding, we must more thoroughly consider the long-term impact of the freedoms of their people and the corresponding impact on relations with the United States.

Countries that continually abuse religious groups, such as Christians, are never going to see eye to eye with the United States because they lack the fundamental belief in the freedom of religion, which is the founding principle of this country.

If we want friends in the Middle East, we have to encourage respect for religious freedom and diversity, not just build strong governments and militaries. If we do this, strong relationships with these countries will be an inevitable outcome, and they will be more stable as a result.

Madam Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### STATES' RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, the World English Dictionary defines "invasion." Among the definitions is: invading with Armed Forces; but it is: any encroachment or intrusion; the onset or advent of something harmful, as in a disease; pathologically, the

spread of cancer from its point of origin into surrounding tissues.

Under Random House Dictionary, the definitions include: the entrance or advent of anything troublesome or harmful, as disease; entrance, as if to take possession or overrun—and it gives the example, the annual invasion of the resort by tourists—and also, infringement by intrusion.

It comes from Middle English from the 1400s. That is where we get our word "invasion" in the English language.

It is important because, in the Constitution, under article I, section 8, it says that Congress has the authority to call for the military during times of invasion. That is the Congress has that power. That is why it is in article I.

Then, as I mentioned yesterday, you have article I, section 10, which the third clause—there are three little clauses or sections there. They are not a numbered section, but the third sentence says:

No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops, or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another State, or with a foreign power, or engage in war, unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

We know that the invasion into France by the Allied Forces consisted of about 150,000 troops, about 150,000 people, was the biggest invasion in history.

Since then, we come up to the year 2014, and The New York Times reported that just in recent months we have had 240,000 adults and 52,000 children—now it is being reported that it is closer to 60,000 children. Initially, as I understand, the article said since April, just 2 months, we have had nearly 300,000 people invade the United States through Texas. Then it is now being reported that there are 300,000 people making their way up from Central America to the United States.

Now, the administration and some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say, well, they are coming because of this massive violence that they have been facing. Well, there is more violence there than there is in much of the United States. Perhaps it is comparable to Chicago. So, if they are wanting to come to a country where there is less violence, maybe they don't want to come to a country that includes Chicago. Perhaps if Chicago maybe had more gun control laws, maybe it wouldn't be so violent. That is my first thought. Then I realize, wait a minute, Chicago has more gun control laws than about anywhere else in the country, yet massive murders.

So, obviously, if people are coming to America from Central America, they don't want to be sent to Chicago. They don't want to be sent to a place where there is more violence than where they have been living. But we are told that is why they are coming.

Well, actually, when I was on the border a couple of weeks ago, and I will

be there this evening, the people that I saw interviewed, the people that were there that I talked to with the help of an interpreter, they said nothing about violence they were coming from. They had gotten word that this President, this administration, was going to allow them to stay and not send them back.

That is why those who had parents who had been illegally in the country—like one little girl, her mother had been here since she was 1 year old. But now that they have gotten word in Central America that if you come illegally into the United States, the Department of Homeland Security is not providing security to the United States. No, they are providing security involved in human trafficking, becoming complicit in the criminal and illegal activity going on.

They actually have given up their role there on the border of homeland security and now they are involved in destroying our security. They are transporting, along with Health and Human Services—forget the word "health." Do you really want people in charge of your health that right now, as I speak here on the floor of the House of Representatives, involved in transporting people all over our country with disease like tuberculosis, H1N1, which can be fatal, who knows how many kinds of flu that people may not have been inoculated for, scabies, lice, all kinds of disease that the Department, formerly called "Health and Human Services," is now engaged in spreading bad health and disease around the country. Thank you so much Health and Human Services.

So we are in a time when the administration in charge is engaged in more lawlessness than any time in my lifetime. They are engaged in actually violating the hippocratic oath if the national leaders were doctors and took that oath.

□ 1245

It says, First do no harm. Yet harm is being done by this administration as they are spreading people around the country that are coming here in massive, invasive ways.

And our heart goes out to them. When I see these children down on the border in the middle of the night, what kind of parent sends their child, or even sends word back home, Hey, I've got a good job. I've been working here illegally for a number of years. And even though I haven't done anything for my child over the last several years, now that the U.S. is giving benefits like feeding, providing health care, giving lawyers to people that come in—especially children—bring them on up.

We may bring in lots of people.

There is story today from The Washington Times, "Obama Seeks Brisk Passage of Border Children Funding Bill." Of course, he wants to do that, because it would subsidize lawyers for illegal immigrants.

People are fond of referring to the Constitution and saying, Well, we have

got to make sure people have their constitutional rights. Well, guess what? The Constitution does not guarantee the same rights to everyone. It does not guarantee the same rights to immigrants who come in legally. For sure, it does not provide the same rights to those who come into our country in violation of our law from the beginning.

It does not provide all of the same freedoms and liberties to our members of the military. As a former member of the United States Army, 4 years on Active Duty, I find it extremely offensive that an administration will seek to coddle terrorists who have killed Americans in cold blood—and been thrilled that they did so—and have written that they were thrilled that they did so, and they hope they have a chance to kill many more Americans. They coddle them and give them more rights than we do our own United States military members who are willing to lay down their lives to save this country.

That's right. Under our Constitution, article 1, section 8 gives Congress the power to provide what rights the military will have and what discipline will be utilized. That is how it was constitutional for Congress to pass the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

I can assure you that in the military you do not have the right to freedom of assembly when and where you want to. Otherwise, I would have indicated that to my commanding officer at 4 in the morning when he wanted me to be out there to go 20 miles at 5.

I would have indicated a lot of things if I were able to have freedom of speech in the Army, because there were times when my superior commissioned officer gave orders that I thought were absolutely stupid, but you don't have all those same constitutional rights everybody else does. It depends on who you are and where you fall under the Constitution.

When it comes to immigration and naturalization, that is a power reserved for the United States Congress. As my old constitutional law professor David Guinn says, there is only one court in the entire Constitution that is created. Every other court owes its entire existence, jurisdiction, and actually, ability to remain in existence to the United States Congress.

That is why it is actually amusing when I hear people who are fairly smart, some of them educated in the Ivy League—despite perhaps the education that they missed out on getting as good as they might have gotten from somewhere else, like Texas A&M—and they think under the Constitution everybody gets the same rights. They do not.

I have heard people even from the holy Ivy League schools who say that everybody has the right to be in a U.S. District Court. Well, that is interesting because there is no right to even have a United States District Court. If Congress decided to eliminate all District

Courts and create some other kind of court system, we could do that. That is totally up to us. We get to set up whatever tribunals—the word that is in the Constitution—underneath the Supreme Court that we care to, or not set it up. It is up to Congress. That is the authority of Congress.

So the President thinks we need to provide lawyers for illegal immigrants, and that is so interesting. I am sure that it is the perspective he gets. I know from Ed Klein's book there were indications that his able adviser, Valerie Jarrett, according to the book, is quite concerned about who is going to be the last person to give our President advice, because he is so easily swayed. So they try to make sure that he is not last advised by someone that disagrees with Valerie Jarrett or Michelle Obama's position.

Well, unfortunately, he was just at a big fundraiser in Dallas held for him by lawyers. Lo and behold, he says he wants lawyers to be paid for out of this \$3.7 billion. Isn't that something? There are lawyers that are providing their services for free to illegal immigrants.

There is no constitutional requirement for someone coming into this country illegally to get a lawyer. It is not there. It is not even in the shadow of a penumbra. It is just not there.

Well, the President wants money for that. And when you break down what the President's wants money for, there is even money in his \$3.7 billion—not for the military so that we can provide for the common defense—for leadership training for those who have come into our country illegally.

Yes, that is right. We need to train them for leadership so they can be good community organizers. And maybe if they learn well at these leadership training courses and they really pick it up well, maybe they, too, can be a worker at a place like ACORN, a place where they can train people how to vote Democrat, a place where they can make sure that they take voter registration forms out to other people who came in illegally.

Madam Speaker, what is happening in this country is outrageous beyond measure.

There are those who say, Well, sure, it is a certainty that these people—we are told about 78 or 80 percent of the people coming are adults and 20 percent or less are actually children—are coming to avoid violence, yet there has been no big spike in violence. So why all of a sudden this huge influx?

And though the administration officials say with a straight face, Well, we are just totally surprised, then we see from January they were requesting transportation in the near months for tens of thousands of children that would be coming in.

So forget what is said orally. Look what they have done. They have induced, lured, encouraged people to flood into our country in an invasion, and then they have prepared for the in-

vasion, and now they say if you don't give us \$3.7 billion, we are going to let it keep happening.

They don't use those words, but they might as well, when there is a far simpler solution.

If you want to really get down to the bottom of what is going on, Madam Speaker, you can look at a map of Central America. These countries where most people are coming from, over a thousand miles up through Mexico, risking life and limb to travel that far—so-called unaccompanied children that couldn't possibly come that far without help—right on their borders you have Costa Rica, you have Panama, you have Nicaragua.

You don't have to go 500 miles to reach one of these countries. There are some places of violence in those countries, but there are also some places of peace in those countries.

So if this were really all about escaping violence, and you really cared about a child, the last thing you would do is send them over a thousand miles and put them in the hands of drug cartels that may sexually abuse them, sell them into sex trafficking, or use them as drug carriers. They could just send those kids to a neighboring country where they speak the same language and where they could be cared for.

This is not about people running to America to get away from violence.

Also, we shouldn't be granting asylum to people that are lawfully in Mexico. We saw the article this week where Mexico has worked out an arrangement with Guatemala where they will have legal passage through Mexico in order to come into the United States illegally. That would mean that Mexico and Guatemala are conspiring to violate United States law.

Well, if they were in the United States, that would allow pursuit of those countries through RICO, but since they are countries, it is a different situation. But that is a criminal enterprise when you conspire with another to help violate United States law.

An article here from The Washington Free Beacon says, as of July 10, "Unaccompanied Alien Children Program Cost \$263 Million."

For the 57,000 children that are here, you could take the \$3.7 billion and give them each \$67,000, and we would be a lot better off. Because that \$3.7 billion, if we do what the President wants, doesn't actually stop the invasion that is going on. We are going to have to be spending that over and over and over again.

So I am not advocating we give everybody that comes in \$67,000. I am just pointing out it would be cheaper to do that than what the President is proposing.

A story from Breitbart says, "Health and Human Services Secretary: Beds for Illegals Can Cost Feds Up to 1K." Well, I am staying at a cheap motel in McAllen tonight, and I know it doesn't cost me a thousand dollars for the bed I am staying in.

There is a time for Congress to say, Enough is enough, Mr. President.

Initially, we didn't want to believe that anybody would intentionally lure people into the United States. We hoped that it was a reckless or a negligent act and not intentional. But look at the evidence. It hasn't been stopped. Even with \$3.7 billion that is requested, there is no way, for what that is being called for, that it is going to stop the invasion that is occurring.

□ 1300

That is why I am hoping that my Governor will utilize article I, section 10, which allows a State that is being invaded—in our case, more than twice as many, just in recent months—more than twice as many than invaded France on D-day, with a doubling of that coming en route, on their way here now.

Under article I, section 10, the State of Texas would appear to have the right to use whatever means, whether it is troops, even using ships of war, even exacting a tax on interstate commerce that it wouldn't normally be allowed to have or utilize—they would be entitled, in order to pay to stop the invasion.

Texas could, under article I, section 10, engage in agreements with, say, Arizona, New Mexico—I don't know that California would agree as they are too busy sending jobs to Texas right now. The States could enter a compact to work together to stop the invasion.

Actually, if Texas just simply did what Woodrow Wilson did after Pancho Villa's thugs killed a bunch of American families—he crossed our border to kill them. One of my least favorite Presidents in our history, Woodrow Wilson, sent this new thing called the National Guard down.

You can read all kinds of different versions of how many National Guard troops he sent to the border. Whether it was 19,000 or 159,000—whatever it was—he sent thousands of National Guard troops to our border, and it was secured, and nobody came in that President Wilson did not want to come in.

He also sent General Pershing into Mexico in pursuit of Pancho Villa. He caught some of the lieutenants. He never caught Pancho Villa. I am not advocating an invasion into Mexico. I am advocating strongly that we stop the invasion into the United States.

Do you want to talk about compassion for children? My children have now finished college, but I go to schools all over Texas. I look in those precious little faces, just as I have looked at the precious little faces of people coming in illegally, but those whose parents are paying taxes, who are law-abiding, know their schools are having trouble, in many places, staying afloat.

Many school districts are in desperate trouble financially, and now, we are going to add hundreds of children in some places whose parents are not

paying taxes and who are not paying property taxes to support the schools in many cases.

You are going to overwhelm those schools because you refuse to do the job the Constitution requires and that an oath was taken to faithfully execute.

We owe this country an obligation to protect it and to protect those little children whose educations will be impaired because you have to slow them down to bring other students along who don't speak the language.

Right now, in Texas, I am told that, basically, you need to speak Spanish. You really do. Why is that? Because the President is allowing so many people in the country illegally, without stopping the invasion—and we are being forced to educate those folks.

When you talk to people, as I have, down around the border—border patrolmen, constables, and others who find dead bodies—and particularly landowners find dead bodies—one border patrolman tells me, when he finds the dead body of a child, he goes home and weeps.

What are we doing, Mr. President? We are luring people here, and children are dying because they think, gee, they are not enforcing the law. This President is not enforcing the law. He is not protecting the country. The security is down, so we can go rushing in.

It is not to avoid violence. They might go to a less violent place around them. It is to come and get the benefits. The trouble is, now that we are a welfare country, more and more people will overwhelm the system, and it does move us toward being a Third World country.

Now, I have taken a lot of abuse for saying that this action also includes an effort to turn Texas blue. People have said: How outrageous is that, that you might think that a President or an administration might actually take action or refuse to take action just for political gain?

Let's see. Here is an article from RedState. A friend there on November 12, 2013, points out:

Headed by a former field director of Obama for America, Battleground Texas' whole aim is to turn Texas from a so-called "red State" to another California—that is, almost singularly controlled by liberal Democrats.

According to O'Keefe's video, Enroll America, a "501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to maximize the number of uninsured Americans who enroll in health coverage made available by the Affordable Care Act," is sharing data with Battleground Texas.

So they are actually using government money to turn Texas into a State that votes more for Democratic candidates.

Another article from a Democratic group says:

The Lone Star State is changing. From top to bottom of the ballot, we can change the face of Texas politics together.

It goes on to point out how Texans are carrying this movement and that its success could change the face of Presidential politics in this country as

we know it. With 38 electoral votes at stake, a blue Texas would be a surefire road to the White House.

For the first time that I am aware of, we had a President who didn't decide to stop his campaign apparatus after he got elected for a second time and who has expressed the intent of turning Texas into a Democrat voting State.

Madam Speaker, the motives have been widely expressed. It is time to stop the invasion, and we have the power to do it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MEADOWS (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of his sister's death.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 255. An act to amend certain definitions contained in the Provo River Project Transfer Act for purposes for clarifying certain property descriptions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 272. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the "Major General William H. Gourley VA-DOD Outpatient Clinic"

H.R. 291. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

H.R. 330. An act to designate a Distinguished Flying Cross National Memorial at the March Field Air Museum in Riverside, California.

H.R. 356. An act to clarify authority granted under the Act entitled "An Act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes".

H.R. 507. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

H.R. 803. An act to amend the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to strengthen the United States workforce development system through innovation in, and alignment and improvement of, employment, training, and education programs in the United States, and to promote individual and national economic growth, and for other purposes.

H.R. 876. An act to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1158. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to continue stocking fish in certain lakes in the North Cascades National Park, Ross Lake National Recreation Area, and Lake Chelan National Recreation Area.

H.R. 1216. An act to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Vet Center in Prescott, Arizona, as the "Dr. Cameron McKinley Department of Veterans Affairs Veterans Center".