

UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACTIONS BY PRESIDENT OBAMA

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, well, it has been quite an interesting couple of days coming back from Thanksgiving, and this morning, there was an interesting conference, what to do about a President who, for a number of years, a couple dozen of times or so, has made very clear he is not a king, he is not an emperor, he would rather not have to deal with Congress, Congress is a messy thing to deal with, but he can't just do what he wants regarding immigration without following the Constitution and that means, under the Constitution, article I, section 8, Congress has sole authority when it comes to issues like naturalization and immigration.

Prior Congresses have passed laws and made it clear what it takes to become a United States citizen. Now, those laws need fixing. There is no question about that, and despite all of the rhetoric, our friends on the other side of the aisle, when they controlled the majority in the House, majority in the Senate, with President Obama in the White House, chose to absolutely do nothing about correcting immigration problems, securing the border—not even amnesty. Why? Because they know, they see the polls, and the polls make very clear that the American public did not want any type of amnesty.

The President knew were he and the Democrats in the House and Senate, when they had the majority during their 2 years, to have done something like an amnesty bill like the bill the President passed without going through Congress, then they would have surely lost the majority, and the President would definitely not have been reelected in 2012.

□ 1630

And they did not think it was worth risking the majority over an amnesty when the vast majority of Americans did not want it. Why? Because the vast majority of Americans have to comply with the law, and fortunately those same vast number of Americans think everybody else should as well.

Now, we still see emails saying, you know, if we could ever get Congress under Social Security, Congress living under the same laws as everybody else did, then a lot of our problems will be fixed, and that forgets the fact that actually Members of Congress have been paying into Social Security for years.

No Member of Congress has a benefit that every other Federal employee doesn't already have. One of the promises that Republicans made, that they said they would do if they got the majority in November of 1994, is to make sure that Republicans have and Demo-

crats in Congress have to live under the same laws everybody else does.

Now, I was told when I was prevented from continuing to cook ribs that my friends across the aisle, Democrats, and Republicans love—everybody that is not a vegetarian tells me they loved my ribs; and my dear friend LOUISE SLAUGHTER had told me that her late husband, before he passed, as a vegetarian had even eaten two ribs of mine she brought home. So my ribs were a big hit with everybody but the Architect of the Capitol. He told me I couldn't continue to cook because of a violation of the fire code, and that was something Republicans actually changed to make sure that we in Congress had to live under the same laws everybody else does. So we do.

We are supposed to live under the laws everybody else does, but then it comes to amnesty, and some here in the minority think it is just fine for a President to legislate since they are not able to do that while they are in the minority. Didn't do it when they were in the majority. The President didn't do it before his reelection in 2012.

So it is a bit of a conundrum when the President of the United States asserts, as an alleged former constitutional professor, apparently an instructor, all these years he cannot do anything about the immigration problem because the Constitution doesn't allow it. Then, immediately before the grand jury acted in Missouri, the President acts, knowing what was about to happen in Missouri, Ferguson, and knowing Thanksgiving was coming up and a lot of people would take their eye off of what was happening with regard to amnesty, and then the President speaks a new law into existence.

The law is very clear: if you are not legally in the United States, you can't legally hold a job. The President changed that law with a pronouncement and a stroke of his pen, but that is not a legal law.

So we have got to stand up for the Constitution. For a President to avoid taking such action before an election because he knew it would cost him a second term, it would cost his party dramatically in the Senate and House, then to wait and do it immediately after the election and right before Thanksgiving when he thinks people will lose interest, well, Americans are not losing interest. They are still concerned.

Now that the President has taken this unconstitutional action, America is looking at Republicans: You said you were against it. You ran and we elected you to the majority in the House and Senate, and you were saying you would not abide such an unconstitutional action. So what are you going to do about it?

Well, one of the things being proposed is my dear friend TED YOHO—sometimes people say “dear friend” around this body and they say it a bit tongue in cheek, but that is not true of

TED YOHO. He is a great American, and I am very, very proud he is my friend. But in H.R. 5759, titled, Preventing Executive Overreach on Immigration Act, my friend Congressman YOHO has a bill that declares that the President does not have the authority to exempt categories of persons unlawfully present in the United States from removal. Any executive action seeking to exempt these categories of person is a violation of the law and has no legal effect.

The bill goes on to make clear this is a permanent solution that will apply to executive actions that attempt to circumvent the law. Further, this does not affect any appropriation, so it does not risk any government funding or shutdown issues.

It is a constitutional separation of powers issue. So any reform or change to the law must come from congressional legislation, not executive fiat, and basically makes clear an executive fix of the law is unconstitutional, temporary, and establishes a dangerous precedent that could be abused by Presidents of both parties for any area of the law they disagree with.

So that is a great first step, but the problem is, if we do not eliminate the funding for the President's unconstitutional action, then it may be carried out anyway. There is some talk about extending funding to next March. Well, by March people will already have been provided work permits that the law says may not legally have work permits, and it is not likely anything would be done at that point to stop it. Now is the time to stop unconstitutional action.

As the President keeps saying, Congress didn't do anything. It shows that he is getting terrible advice. We had a knock-down, drag-out session the last week of July in this Chamber, and two floors below this Chamber, in the House office buildings, we were fighting it out because, as the President has said, dealing with Congress can be messy.

That is the way the Founders intended it. They wanted it to be difficult to pass laws. And Jefferson, thinking it would be a good idea—though he wasn't there at the Constitutional Convention, so he didn't get this in. It would be a good idea if laws had to be on file for a year before they could even be brought up for a vote. Things done in haste in this body or the Senate are not a good idea.

Yet we must do something to stop the unconstitutional action. The President wants a border bill. We passed one in the House. Somebody needs to advise President Obama's advisers that we passed a good bill. It was not a good bill on Thursday, but by Friday at 10 p.m. or so when we passed it, it was a good bill. Still had more to do. There is much more we can and should do. There is a lot of reforms that must be done, but until the border is secure, then we are just going to have to keep

reforming immigration, reforming immigration, giving amnesty, giving amnesty, until the country is not the country people wanted to come to.

How ironic that people have to leave countries—they believe—because there is graft, corruption, violence, because the rule of law is not enforced fairly across the board, and they want to come to America because, with all the down economy, over 92 million people having given up hope of finding a job, not even looking anymore, this is still one of the greatest economies in the world because we still pretty much try to enforce the law across the board.

So people come from countries where the rule of law is not observed, not enforced fairly across the board—too many friends or people with particular interests of the leaders, they get special privileges, they get exempted from the law. So they come here where we are not supposed to do that, and once here, say, “Look, now that we are here, having come illegally, we want you, United States, to just forget about the law, ignore your Constitution, ignore the laws on immigration, and just waive them and forget about them,” when, in so doing, we would become like the country they felt they had to leave because we don’t enforce the law fairly across the board anymore.

The old saying, capital is a coward, talking about money to be invested, it is a coward. It goes to areas where it feels safest, where the laws will be most fairly applied so that there is something that can be counted on, that laws mean things.

So we have had a lot of investment in the United States of people from China, from Russia, Africa, South America. People around the world have been willing to invest in the United States because we have been a country where capital could be comfortable.

But when mass amnesty is applied, which will ultimately throw however many people are given illegal work permits to work legally, you are going to throw that many million people out of jobs. You will depress the working wage rate.

Mr. Speaker, it can’t be overemphasized that what happened since this President has been in office or in power is what we normally say about monarchs, but what has happened for the first time in American history never happened under any prior President.

But this President’s policies, as he talked about the fat cats on Wall Street, though he received more donations from them than Republicans did; as he bad-mouthed the oil companies, but he had friends that were doing favors for him; as he bad-mouthed capital cronyism as capital cronyism was exactly what was occurring in this country and from this administration, actually for the first time in our history, 95 percent of all income in America went to the top 1 percent of income earners. It has never happened before.

I know—I know—this administration, everybody in it talks about the fat cats

and going after the rich, and yet, amazingly, as they talk about going after the rich, it is as if there is a wink and a nod: We are going to talk bad about you, call you fat cats, but you are going to get richer than you have ever been. Just don’t forget us when it comes to political contributions. Oh, yeah, we will trash the Koch Brothers, but they can’t hold a candle to the fat-cat Democratic contributors.

But when you try to get your head around 95 percent of the income going to the top 1 percent in America, it is extraordinary. The President himself acknowledged, September a year ago, that this was happening on his watch.

□ 1645

Again, people can talk about the middle class getting bigger and wages being suppressed. Their solution is to bring in 5 million new workers willing to work a lot cheaper, without health insurance, to compete with Americans that need a little more in order to live and that need health insurance.

And the solution is to bring in 5 million people more? Do you really want to see minority unemployment go even higher than its current skyrocketing position?

That is not fair to Americans. Our oath is to this country and the people in it, and the way we do that is by defending the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. It is time the poor and the middle class in America were helped by having a better wage, by not continuing to leave the borders open, by not winking and nodding and unconstitutionally allowing 5 million people to work illegally but with the stamp of approval from the White House. It is time to stop it before we lose the Constitution altogether.

Here is an article from Steven Camarota and Karen Ziegler. The headline, “Immigrant Families Benefit Significantly from ObamaCare,” and the subheadline, “Immigrant Families Accounted for 42 Percent of Medicaid Growth Since 2011.”

The article says:

A key part of the Affordable Care Act is Medicaid expansion for those with low incomes. A new analysis of government data by the Center for Immigration Studies shows that immigrants and their U.S.-born children, under age 18, have been among the primary beneficiaries of Medicaid growth. The data show that immigrants and their children accounted for 42 percent of the growth in Medicaid enrollment from 2011 to 2013. Immigrants benefited more from Medicaid expansion than natives because a much larger share of immigrants are poor and uninsured.

It seems almost certain that immigrants and their children will continue to benefit disproportionately from ObamaCare, as they remain much more likely than natives to be uninsured or poor. The available evidence indicates that Medicaid growth associated with immigrants is largely among those legally in the country.

Nonetheless, immigrants, this points out:

The number of immigrants and their U.S.-born children on Medicaid grew twice as fast

as the number of natives and their children on Medicaid from 2011 to 2013.

Immigrants and their children accounted for 42 percent of Medicaid enrollment growth from 2011 to 2013, even though they accounted for only 17 percent of the Nation’s total population and 23 percent of overall U.S. population growth in the same time period.

About two-thirds of the growth in Medicaid associated with immigrants was among immigrants themselves, rather than U.S.-born children of immigrants.

It is an interesting issue because when my friend STEVE KING and I were in England in recent years, we were told there that the law is very clear. They know that their country would fail if they just say everybody that comes in is immediately entitled to every Federal subsidy the British Government offers, so they have a requirement in England that you are not entitled to any benefit, we were told, until you have paid into the British system for at least 5 years.

Well, that kind of makes sense, and having just been over there and had a chance to address members from the House of Commons and House of Lords, having spoken at Cambridge and Oxford, they are trying to save their country over there, but there was a great deal of welfare that is hurting the system and their economics. Even so, they have a law that says you can’t even get these kind of benefits until you have paid into their system for 5 years.

Why isn’t there something like that in the President’s new law that he spoke into being? Perhaps that ought to be the first reform that both Houses take up. You can’t receive any kind of benefit from the U.S. Government unless you have paid into the U.S. Government for at least 5 years, and that does not include getting more money back year after year than you pay in.

An article yesterday indicated one woman in Virginia had been largely using people that were illegally in the country to file for child tax credits so they can get back \$4,000, \$7,000, \$1,500 more than they paid in, and it was a scam.

If one woman in Virginia can be accountable for \$7,000 in child tax credits being paid out more than people paid in, how many people are there across the United States that are doing that same thing, while we have workers across the country, like in my district, that have said that because ObamaCare changed the definition of part-time work, it forced them into a situation of having to work two part-time jobs, not having health insurance anymore, and just struggling just to survive, just to live; yet when it comes to people that have not paid a dime into the system, all of a sudden, we are just going to bend over backwards and violate the Constitution for them.

There is an article in Breitbart today from Tony Lee that said:

One in three illegal immigrants over the age of 25 in America do not even have a high school education, according to a New Migration Policy Institute report.

The Migration Policy Institute estimates there are 8.512 million illegal immigrant adults 25 years of age or older. The study found that while 49 percent of illegal immigrants 25 years or older have at least a high school diploma or a GED, 17 percent have some high school education, while 33 percent do not have any high school education.

Of course, we have got people of all races, national origins, and both genders trying to get into this country. They have been trying for years and years to do so legally. They could fill needed specialized positions to help our economy grow; yet they can't get a visa. They are not about to get amnesty. We have got things completely backwards.

We know, of course, when the President talks about amnesty and legal status—along with other people here in Washington—our border patrolmen make clear over and over that that increases the number of people coming across our border.

Thank God Texas has stepped up. The State of Texas has been paying tremendous amounts of money to have additional people on the border. At night, you can see their profile—DPS troopers, Texas Rangers, game wardens—where they can call people in speedboats that Texas has paid for to rush up and try to catch the coyotes bringing people across illegally.

The coyotes don't want to be caught. The people do. They want to turn themselves in as quick as they can. The coyotes don't want to be caught, so they are not going to come across if they think they are going to get caught before they can get across with their raft.

One of the other things that ought to scare law enforcement dramatically is the fact that I have heard a number of people say, as they were questioned by our border patrolmen out in the middle of the night, and they are asked—it's not on the standard questions, but they have been asked many times by our border patrolmen, "How much did you have to pay the gangs or the drug cartels to bring you across?" Sometimes, it is \$5,000, \$6,000, \$7,000, or \$8,000.

Sometimes, a followup question is asked, "Where did you get that kind of money in El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, or wherever you came from?" Often, the answer was, "Well, some of the friends or family in the U.S. sent money. We have been trying to collect money in our home country."

Every now and then, you get a response that scares me and is probably at the bottom of many of the people's payments to come and be brought in illegally by drug cartels and gangs. They have confided, "They are going to let us work some of the rest of it off."

Well, what does that mean? It means when Health and Human Services picks people up and transmits them across the country—with scabies, as we have seen happen, and whatever disease they may bring in—as some have pointed out, that means every State is a border State, thanks to Health and Human

Services shipping them around the country.

As they build up their numbers in different cities around the country and they owe the drug cartels that are ruthless, unscrupulous, and don't mind torturing and killing, we hear more and more about Mexican drug cartel activities around the country and our cities, how horrendous it is that the United States Department of Homeland Security and the United States Department of Health and Human Services being complicit in helping ship agents for the drug cartels and gangs around the country that can be intimidated and reminded, "Remember, you still owe us \$3,000, \$4,000, \$5,000, and here's how you will work it off."

Is it sex trade? Is it drugs that are poisoning more of our American teenagers and young adults with the Mexican drugs being brought in?

If the drug cartels are getting promises from people coming into the United States illegally that they will work off the rest of the money, then you can bet the drug cartels are going to see that they do.

I have been told by border patrolmen that you don't cross the U.S. border without some drug cartel, some gang, some organized crime being in charge of the area of the border where you crossed, and you dare not cross across Mexico into the United States without the permission of whatever organized criminal group is in charge. They say they will come after them.

We are bringing in agents of drug cartels and shipping them around the country where they can work for the drug cartels. It is what they have said there on the border. "Yeah, they are going to let me work this off."

Well, in talking to the border patrolmen there in the middle of the night down on the border, they tell you some interesting things. As I have been told by the border patrolmen, "You know what the drug cartels call us Federal agents here in the U.S.? They borrow from a commercial on television and say, 'We're the logistics.'"

The United States Federal employees are the drug cartels' logistics. All they have to do is get their agents that are going to work for the drug cartels into the United States, and then the United States Government ships them around the country for the drug cartels.

All they have to do is say, "This is where I've got somebody—a family member, a loved one—and that's where I need to go," and we ship them free of charge. The U.S. Government makes it free of charge at least to the immigrant coming in illegally.

Of course, there is no free lunch, as Phil Graham used to repeatedly say. Somebody is paying for it, and to a limited extent, it is American taxpayers. To another extent, it is our children and grandchildren who are incurring the debts that will be paid with income they have never even figured out what job they will be deriving the income from. It is immoral.

□ 1700

Here is an article from Politico saying, the DHS chief, short-term funding a very bad idea. So it turns out Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson warned Tuesday that a short-term funding measure for his agency will be "a very bad idea," telling Congress such a bill would hold up everything from hiring Secret Service agents to paying for border security.

Well, we still have people that are saying, though, you know, in a CR and an omnibus, we really can't put restrictions on the Federal Government in there. And yet, here is a report regarding the last omnibus highlights where there were 17 different restrictions on agencies' use of fees in the last fiscal year.

This was done with the help of the Congressional Research Service that reviewed the previous spending omnibus. And Senator JEFF SESSIONS, dear friend, great guy, he has been able to identify 17 separate restrictions.

One was a restriction in section 543 on the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services that said, notwithstanding section 1356(n), title VIII, U.S. Code, of the funds deposited into the immigration examinations fee account, \$7,500,000 may be allocated by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services fiscal year 2014 for the purpose of providing an immigrant integration grants program.

There is one for the Department of Agriculture, Department of Justice, Transportation Security Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Federal Communications Commission, Security and Exchange Commission, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation Enforcement, Copyright Office, Export-Import Bank of the United States.

So we know it can be done. It has been done. The restrictions have been made in past omnibuses, even just last year. So we can do that, and we should do that.

If we don't do that, then the President's unconstitutional act is going to be a harbinger of terrible things to come. Once you no longer have a Constitution that means anything, then Presidents can pretty much do as they wish.

That is what happens in Third World countries. That is why we have lasted over 200 years, because the Constitution meant something. It took a civil war to make the Constitution more enforcing of what it said. It took someone like Dr. King giving his life to ensure civil rights for everyone, as the Constitution guaranteed.

But once we have moved into this post-constitutional era, where the Constitution no longer is enforced, it is just a document, then there is no skeleton on which to hang muscle and the might that makes a strong country, and we become, figuratively speaking, a blob of a nation without structure that can't defend itself adequately, that has drug cartel agents throughout

the country, that continues to have people sending wives in to have children in the United States free of charge and leaving to go back home with, actually, a U.S. passport as an American citizen.

I think that is how Anwar al-Awlaki, whom the President was so concerned about he blew him up with a drone strike—he was an American citizen. His parents came over from Yemen on visas, and he was born here, but taken back, grew up learning to hate America.

The deputy leader of Hamas, Mousa Abu Marzook, his wife came to the U.S., had a child that, no doubt, is being taught to hate America.

Palestinian Islamic jihad leader Sami Al-Arian, his wife came to the United States, had a child, American citizen.

Abdul Rahman al-Amoudi, who is doing 23 years in prison for supporting terrorism, financing terrorism, his wife had a child here in the United States, an American citizen.

Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the 9/11 mastermind, even has confessed to that in his own written pleadings and said, if our act of terror created terror in your heart, then praise be to Allah. Basically, in his six-page pleading, he said, you had it coming.

I think there is possibly a chance he would raise a child to hate America.

And then the Muslim Brother President of Egypt, Mohamed Morsi, his wife came to America. Irony of ironies, he thought he was being very clever to have an American citizen daughter, yet the Egyptian people didn't think it was so clever. They didn't like the idea.

When he became such an unconstitutional actor as a President that he could no longer be tolerated, be allowed to be left in office, 20 million Egyptians were reported in the streets of Egypt demanding his removal, followed by another demonstration of 30 million to 33 million Egyptians, moderate Muslims, Christians, Jews, secularists, out in the streets demanding, we don't want a radical Islamist in control of our country, Egypt.

Amazing. Such a huge event in the realm of human history in Egypt. God bless the Egyptians. We need to pray for them, we need to help them.

But not this administration. This administration says, oh, so you ousted the Muslim Brother, part of the organization that wants to bring down America, and you ousted him?

Well, if you don't put him back in power we are not going to send you the Apache helicopters you are using to keep the Suez Canal open. We are not going to send you what you need to deweaponize the Sinai that Morsi saw weaponized.

No, we are going to hold back any weapons that will help you clean up the radicalization in Egypt and Sinai that Morsi oversaw, which is why some of the moderate Muslim leaders in the Middle East and North Africa continue to ask, why do you keep helping your enemies?

Do you not understand that the Muslim Brothers are your enemy?

Do you not understand that the Muslim Brothers want the United States as part of a caliphate?

Well, the Department of Homeland Security and this administration and mainstream media belittled me for the last couple of years or so as I continued to point out that they had an adviser on their top Homeland Security Advisory Council who had used his classification that Janet Napolitano gave him in an inappropriate way; that he had spoken—he was listed as a speaker paying tribute to the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of vision; that he defended the Holy Land Foundation principals who were convicted of supporting terrorism; failed to properly file the tax forms that would allow his foundation to remain a 501(c)(3). Didn't file them. And yet, he is a top adviser.

Well, even the Obama administration had to finally let him go and, yes, go ahead and accept the resignation when he tweeted out that the international caliphate is inevitable so we need to get used to it. Even the Obama administration had to let him go after that. So he has resigned. He is no longer a top member advising this administration.

But it is time for Americans to wake up. Ignoring the Constitution is not helpful. After over two-dozen statements by this President that he doesn't have the power to, in effect, do what he just now did right before Thanksgiving, demands congressional action. We must stand up and defund the illegal activity of this President.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also important to note that our Republican leaders got duped in July of 2011. I tried to warn. I told people back then, told our whole conference, this supercommittee will not be allowed to reach an agreement by the Democrats.

I was assured, oh, sure they will because it cuts a whole bunch of money from Medicaid and an automatic sequestration if the supercommittee doesn't reach an agreement. So the hundreds of billions, the gutting of our military will never happen because the supercommittee will reach an agreement because they don't want the cuts to Medicare.

Well, it seemed very clear to me, and as I told my Republican friends, no, they are going to prevent the supercommittee from reaching agreement if we pass this bill because they want the cuts to Medicare because they cut over \$700 billion of Medicare funding in ObamaCare without a single Republican vote.

So the only way, in 2012, they will be able to run commercials saying, we love our rich friends more than we love seniors, is if they prevent the supercommittee from reaching an agreement.

The cuts to Medicare are only a fraction of what ObamaCare did but, nonetheless, cuts to Medicare will happen.

And the President has never cared much for the military anyway, and this

allows him, basically, to gut our military to pre-World War II levels. So it is a win, win, win all the way around for the administration if we pass that bill creating a supercommittee.

Well, we did, and the President got the military gutted, Defense Department gutted. The sequestration happened.

And now I am concerned, if we say, all right, we are not going to fund Homeland Security unless you agree, you sign a bill that defunds your illegal activity in providing amnesty to 5 million people, I think we need to be careful about that, Mr. Speaker, because it just may be that the President would like to blame Republicans and say, you know what? Well, I would like to have Border Patrol securing the border, but the Republicans cut off the funding, and so, gee, there is no Border Patrol on the border. It is all the Republicans' fault because they wouldn't fund it.

I think we need to be rather careful about saying we are going to bank on not funding Homeland Security, only fund them for a short time, and then threaten the President, if you don't sign off on a bill defunding your illegal activity, then Homeland Security won't be funded.

As one of my Republican friends pointed out, kind of like the old adage, if you are going to take a hostage, you need to take somebody that the other side doesn't want to see killed. And there is some concern that if we take hostage, figuratively speaking, the Homeland Security Department in order to defund the illegal activity of this President's amnesty, it just may be that the President, figuratively again speaking, will say, go ahead, take out your hostage; completely defund Homeland Security. That is okay with me.

□ 1715

No, that is not the way you negotiate.

If we are going to stop the President's unconstitutional amnesty, it is going to require funding everything that needs funding, but to go after something the President really wants but doesn't need. Good grief. When we are spending the trillions of dollars we are, we can certainly afford, for example, to do away with the czars, to do away with the, say, public transportation to golf outings.

We can save millions of dollars just on that alone. This is what you do in negotiation. For those of us who have negotiated multimillion-dollar deals and multimillion-dollar settlements, that is what you do. You have to find something that is very important to the other side, but that is really not necessary, so that the other side, when you are negotiating, knows you mean business. I don't think Homeland Security is the place to threaten.

We have got to defund the illegal activity, or of those who fought to defend the Constitution, who picked up the Stars and Stripes in representing our

Nation—our constitutional Republic—and carried it as fellow soldiers were killed and who advanced freedom here in America, their blood will be on our hands because we wouldn't even stand for the Constitution when there were no bullets being fired. We have got to stand up for America and for our Constitution.

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

ALZHEIMER'S

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRIDENSTINE). 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, tonight, I want to spend some time with my colleagues discussing something that we actually can do for every American family, something that the Congress of the United States can take action on soon, like this week, when we pass our appropriations bill or, perhaps, next week if we fail to get the job done this week.

We can help every American family tomorrow, the next day, and on into the years out ahead if we take action. The subject matter of tonight is about an issue that affects every American family wherever you are out there—my own family, your family, the families of my staff, perhaps even the families of those who are working with us tonight.

This is an illness. This is an illness that has become the most expensive and will soon become the most pervasive illness in America. It is Alzheimer's. It is dementia associated with Alzheimer's. It is a devastating illness.

It is one that robs individuals of their mental abilities. It robs them of their memories of their families, of their work, of their lives. It confuses and muddles their thoughts, and eventually, it will destroy that individual, so tonight, we talk about Alzheimer's.

Is there anyone out there, any family, any individual, who hasn't seen this illness? I think we all have.

Let's get into it in some detail. A little later, as my colleagues join us, we will continue the discussion and talk about what we can do—your Representatives. There are 535 of us—435 here in the House of Representatives from every part of this Nation and from every walk of life and from every community, and there are the 100 Senators from every State. Let's use some of these charts to see if we can get a better fix on what we are actually facing here in America.

Let's see. Alzheimer's is the most expensive disease in America. One in five Medicare dollars is currently spent on people with Alzheimer's, 20 percent of every Medicare dollar. In fact, the total cost of Alzheimer's today—this year, 2014—is over \$215 billion—a quar-

ter of a trillion dollars. More and more of that money will come from Medicare as the baby boom population begins to move into its more senior years.

This illness is not just found in seniors. We are also learning about the early onset of Alzheimer's, men and women in their thirties and forties—early Alzheimer's. Of course, it extends on, mostly in the more senior population, 60–65 and above.

This is an illness that is also associated with genetics. If you have Alzheimer's in your family, there is a higher probability that you will have Alzheimer's yourself, but it is also an illness that is associated with brain damage that can occur from concussions.

I think we have all heard about the National Football League players who have suffered with one form of dementia or another and who have died early because of it. We also know that traumatic brain injuries are the most common injuries found among our troops who have returned from Afghanistan and Iraq.

Alzheimer's, it is there. It is very expensive.

What can we look forward to in the future? Let's see. This is Medicare and Medicaid—the Federal Government expenditures—not the family expenditures, not the expenditures by health insurance companies. This is just the Federal Government.

Today, it is about \$122 billion. By the end of this decade, it will be \$195 billion. As this wave of baby boomers passes through our demography and through our society, we expect, by the year 2050, that the Federal Government will be spending over \$880 billion—\$120 billion short of \$1 trillion—on this illness, and this may be just two-thirds of the total cost. Well over \$1.2 trillion will be spent in about 35 years on this illness.

Do you want to bust the budget? Do you want to see the deficits of America soar almost uncontrollably? Then look to Alzheimer's and dementia and the effect that they will have on the Federal budget deficit. Pay attention to these numbers because these numbers are the story of the American Federal budget and of the personal budgets of families across this Nation—Alzheimer's and dementia, \$880 billion of Medicare and Medicaid money by 2050.

There is another way of looking at it. It is a different graph but the same story. The already high cost of Alzheimer's will skyrocket as the baby boom moves through the population. There it is: the same numbers, the same graph, the same extraordinary challenge facing America.

I should also mention that this is not just an American issue; this is an issue for every advanced economy in the world. If you are able to avoid the childhood illnesses—the illnesses that kill so many in the developing world—then those economies that have advanced to the more developed economies face the exact same population

surge and costs associated with Alzheimer's and dementia.

What can we do about it? We can actually do a lot. I suspect, if you are looking at this on your TV screens or are here in the audience, you really only see the green line. This speaks of the treatment for Alzheimer's: today, \$250 billion by Federal and local and private.

On this one over here is research, treatment versus research. It is the old adage: You spend it now or spend a lot more later. A penny saved is a penny earned.

What does research amount to? I have to pull this up close—oh, here it is. We are spending \$122 billion to \$150 billion or so of Federal and State money. What are we spending on research? \$566 million. Billions? Millions? What does research amount to? It actually works. Research actually will solve problems, medical research.

How long have we been at polio? I remember growing up around the issues of polio. It was very common in our communities, then some money was spent on research and a polio vaccine. You don't see polio in our communities anymore.

The research worked with the development of the Salk vaccine, followed by other vaccines to treat polio. It is essentially wiped out in America. It only exists in a few very isolated places in the world. If we were to spend the money on a vaccination in those areas, we would see polio disappear from our world. The same thing happened with smallpox.

I want to show you something more of today. Let's look at the research budgets for those programs that are active today: investments in health research at the National Institutes of Health, \$2,014; cancer research, \$5.4 billion on cancer research.

Enough? Probably not. We probably could and should spend more on cancer research. Should we do so, I would suspect that we would see even more success in treating cancer in its earliest stages.

HIV/AIDS, nearly \$3 billion on HIV/AIDS—have we solved the problem? No, but we have certainly figured out how people can live with HIV/AIDS, and we are probably going to see a vaccine sometime in the near future. This is what we are currently spending—nearly \$3 billion—on HIV/AIDS.

Cardiovascular issues—stroke, heart attacks, other kinds of cardiovascular illnesses—just around \$2 billion or slightly more is spent on that.

The most expensive, the most prevalent of all of the illnesses is Alzheimer's, \$566 million. It's not billions—not \$2 billion, not \$3 billion, not \$5.5 billion—but \$566 million.

What is the result of all of this? What does it mean when you spend this kind of money on research? It really means something very good happens, that something really, really good happens when you spend money on research. With polio research and a polio vaccine, polio is no longer found in the United States.