

I think what we are hearing tonight from our members of the Congressional Black Caucus is that they are trying to take us back in history. They are trying to take us back to an era of time, and we are not going to let them do that. We have too much at stake. We have gained so much.

Someone may ask us tonight: Why are we here? Why are we the conscience of the Congress, Mr. Speaker? Why are we here tonight talking about the road to ruin and destruction by not having a congressional budget?

I think the facts speak for themselves. I think that the American public needs to know that this is not something that just affects the Congressional Black Caucus. I want that to be clear. This affects America.

You mentioned it with Mr. CLYBURN's 10-20-30. The fact is more individuals who don't look like members of the Congressional Black Caucus will benefit. And that is the difference between Democrats and Republicans. We care about all people.

They profess to have hearings on poverty, and then when you look at the results of their own budget and what they are doing to those individuals who live in poverty—chuckle we may, clear our voice, Mr. Speaker, as we may—the facts speak for themselves. They are not creating programs that will help us eliminate poverty. And it is as simple as that.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank you for laying that out. And I think history can be judged by objective observers as it relates to fiscal responsibility. But a few facts that perhaps some in the Chamber may have had amnesia about, but maybe it bears going through.

Sequestration and painful budget cuts as it relates to the extreme agenda of some here in the Congress have been brought to us in a manner that has cost us both jobs and the ability to experience accelerated financial growth.

We saw in the aftermath of a severe economic shock the approach that was taken by our friends over in Europe of extreme austerity did not bear financial fruit. It was the stimulus package that was put forth—with not a single vote from anyone on the other side of the aisle—that was actually the financially responsible approach taken to help deal with the train wreck that President Obama inherited and to get the economy back on track.

But, of course, the objective from the very beginning—not my words, but the words of the Senate majority leader on the other side of the Capitol—was to make the President a one-term President.

I just don't even understand the philosophy of a President who takes office, inherits the worst economy since the Great Depression, and the number one agenda is to make sure that he is a one-term President. But that was an unsuccessful political endeavor. He gets a second term.

The first thing that some of my good friends on the other side of the aisle de-

cide to do, as we approach the end of the fiscal year in 2013, was to shut down the government for 16 days. It cost us \$24 billion in lost economic productivity. That is not hyperbole. Those are facts.

And what was it all for?

Because there is this obsession—perhaps clinical in nature—with the Affordable Care Act. This is why we voted more than 50 times to destroy it, defeat it, delay it, and do everything possible to stop it.

What could be possibly wrong with making sure that preexisting conditions don't prevent someone here in the greatest country in the history of the world from being able to get adequate medical care? What is wrong with more than 20 million previously uninsured Americans actually having health care?

Yet, in the budget that apparently is not extreme enough, we would take away the Affordable Care Act.

So these are just some of the facts. I wish we had some more time to explore it. That is not hyperbole. Historians will judge this Presidency and this Congress. I, of course, am of the belief that many will conclude that this is a Congress that has majored in obstruction, minored in dysfunction, and done everything possible to pursue a degree in legislative malpractice to the detriment of the American people. And I am hopeful that we can just get back on track and try to find common ground to do the business of the American people, which is why each and every one of us was sent here to the people's House.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republican controlled House has once again missed a key deadline when it failed to pass a budget resolution before April 15. Despite promises to the contrary, House Speaker PAUL RYAN has been unable to bring a budget resolution to the floor in a timely fashion. This is simply unacceptable.

Completing a budget resolution is an important step in the budget process that will lay out Congress' spending priorities and create a unified vision for a more prosperous nation. While Democrats have endeavored to work cooperatively with Republicans to pass a comprehensive budget resolution, Speaker RYAN has insisted on pushing a budget that divides our country while further slashing critical investments aimed at strengthening our economy. The Republican budget reflects the needs of only a select few instead of the views and priorities of every American and places the burden of deficit reduction squarely on the backs of middle and working class Americans.

It is clear that our most vulnerable segments of the population—the elderly, minorities, low-income earners, and others—have been most impacted by the Great Recession. Yet this latest Republican budget resolution continues to reflect the failed economic worldview that wealth will trickle down when we give massive tax breaks to the wealthy. Time and time again, history has demonstrated that this is simply untrue.

It is unfortunate that the Republican-controlled Congress today is subjecting millions of

hard-working families to even greater pressures to work longer hours for less pay, while we continue to prop up the wealthiest earners and biggest corporations with tax breaks and other loopholes. The Republican budget exemplifies these principles and drives the wedge deeper between the wealthy and our most vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our nation is on a dangerous path under this Republican leadership. Congress should be working to create jobs and increase pay for hard-working American families, not giving additional tax breaks to the wealthy and cutting spending for key social programs. The Republicans have long abandoned their commitment to pass a budget resolution that reflects the needs of all Americans. Thus, I am strongly urging my colleagues to support fiscally sound and morally responsible budget alternatives that will create a level playing field and new opportunities for every American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

#### RESTORING ARTICLE I CONSTITUTIONAL POWER TO CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHIO) for 30 minutes.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on this evening's Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOHIO. Mr. Speaker, if Congress does not assert its constitutional authority, we risk becoming obsolete in the eyes of an Executive that would prefer to legislate with a phone and a pen as a replacement for this body.

Thank you to all my colleagues who join me this evening, and may God bless America.

Every day, before Members of Congress meet to conduct official business, we gather to recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America. We place our right hand over our hearts and promise to our colleagues, our constituents, and all Americans that we will uphold the rule of law.

This very law is the very vehicle that has ensured liberty and justice for all even being a possibility: the rule of law. Unfortunately, this administration seems intent on operating outside the rule of law. It insists upon circumventing Congress by changing laws and legislating from the Oval Office, not from Capitol Hill.

Time and again, the American people have had to bear witness to the blatant disrespect this administration has for

our Constitution. In my heart, I believe this disrespect is on full display in the embattled fight Congress and the American people find themselves in today with the executive branch at the Supreme Court.

This morning, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in the United States v. Texas case, including 25 other States. To some, this case is simply an argument over whether or not you are pro-illegal immigration. Let me repeat that. You are pro-illegal immigration or not. To others, this case is about keeping families together. To many, like myself, it is about protecting the dignity of our Constitution and the balance of powers within the three branches of government.

The United States v. Texas is about the rule of law and defending the integrity of our great institution of government. We are a constitutional Republic. And yet, the President's mass deferred action on deportation of individuals residing within our country illegally would make it seem more like we are living in a dictatorship.

The Constitution is clear on the issues of legislation. Article I, section 1 explicitly states: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Let that sink in for a moment. "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Article I, section 8, clause 4: "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization." That is solely the responsibility of this body. Take notice of the absence of any reference to the executive office, executive branch, or judicial branch.

Article II, section 3, however, states that the President "shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed." It is referred to as the Take Care Clause. That the laws be faithfully executed, not established, not rewritten, not selectively enforce portions of law, but to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

□ 2045

That power is still delegated to Congress just as it was over two centuries ago.

If the Supreme Court upholds the administrative executive action, I fear that our Republic—that is the United States—will die. We will see an end of a Nation that started by fending off tyranny. We will see the end of a Nation which has withstood a civil war, two world wars, and countless terrorist attacks.

Terrorists hate the United States simply because of the manner through which we have prospered under the freedoms enshrined in the Constitution.

Again, the success of our Nation is because we are a land and a Nation of laws. I urge all of my colleagues in the

House and the Senate to not falter in their defense of the founding principles upon which this great Nation was built.

Interesting, today, at the Supreme Court, I was there to speak on these very topics. Many pro-illegal immigrants were present, and I found it very interesting they were shouting, demonstrating, exercising freedom of speech, freedom of speech and demonstrating in America, simply because we have a Constitution that protects that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to discuss the case being heard before the Supreme Court, United States v. Texas, and the President's unconstitutional executive actions on immigration and the need for the restoration of the balance of powers between the branches of government. This case is the challenge to President Obama's executive actions for illegal immigrants, the so-called Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, otherwise known as DAPA, an expansion of the earlier Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, otherwise known as DACA. The lawsuit was brought by Governors and attorneys general from the Texas Supreme Court and 25 other States. That is significant, in and of itself.

Under these unconstitutional programs, President Obama claims the right to, by executive fiat, make an illegal immigrant "lawfully present." Let me say that again real slow. The President claims, by right, by executive fiat, to make an illegal immigrant "lawfully present" in the United States and eligible to receive a work permit after an application is reviewed and a fee is paid. This is straight out of "1984."

The language is upside down. The government is handing out work permits and making illegal immigrants eligible to work in the United States as well as receive Social Security, unemployment, and disability benefits. But this only hurts American citizens and taxpayers.

What has Congress done about this? Not enough.

The real issue in this case is not discretion, but whether or not there is any limit at all on Presidential power.

The Founders recognized these distinctions, and they made Congress the first branch among equals of the Federal Government and the most accountable branch to the American people—and thus, Article I, not II. The Congress is Article I.

The Founders created a system of checks and balances to ensure no individual could gain absolute power within the government without a check, not even George Washington, whom they all loved.

Under our Constitution, the Congress is entrusted with "all legislative powers"—all, including the power "to establish a uniform rule of naturalization."

The Founders drafted the Constitution to clearly state that it is not the President who writes the laws; Congress does. Much of the President's job is to faithfully execute these laws passed by Congress. In fact, neither any immigration law nor the Constitution empowers the Executive to authorize, let alone facilitate, the violation of the laws passed by Congress. The President even acknowledged this 22 times on TV before using his pen and phone to act alone without Congress.

This imbalance of powers is a threat to self-government itself. Our inaction, time and again, has expanded the administrative state and left the American people without a voice in Washington. The Presidential elections on both sides of the aisle are making this abundantly clear.

For starters, we can advocate for reforms in four principled areas: reclaiming Congress' power of the purse, reforming executive-empowering legislative "cliffs," restoring congressional authority over regulations and regulators, and reining in executive discretion.

I have sponsored simple legislation to do just that: return power back to Congress. I introduced a bill to reform this process with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, USCIS, the primary agency for implementing the President's immigration executive order.

USCIS funds itself through application fees, which insulates it from the will of the American people as expressed through their Representatives in Congress. Congress cannot effectively exercise its powers through the appropriations process to perform basic oversight functions and ensure the agency is executing the laws faithfully.

My proposal, the Use Spending for Congressional Immigration Supervision, USCIS, Act, will make unaccountable agencies like the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services accountable to Congress and, therefore, accountable to the American people. Putting USCIS on appropriations ensures that unelected bureaucrats are held accountable and provides transparency for how the Federal Government is raising and spending your money.

Congress needs to reassert its power of the purse by making agency budgets subject to appropriations, but we cannot stop there. There is more Congress has to do to restore Congress' power to hold the executive branch accountable. The Constitution still gives Congress all its powers. It is up to Congress to step up and start using them.

Mr. YOHO. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King).

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Florida for organizing this Special Order, for his leadership, for his constitutional convictions, and for the opportunity to address you tonight, Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I am listening to this dialogue that is taking place here on the floor, and this thought occurred to me that, several years ago, our borders are so open and our borders are so porous, and we have a President who has refused to enforce the law. In fact, he sends the message through his executive branch, if you are determined to enforce the law and you are a member of the Border Patrol, you had better find another job. I mean, that came out of the President and his leadership team all the way on down to our Border Patrol agents.

I have been down to the border a good number of times, and I have watched as people come across the border in broad daylight, float across there in a raft. They get unloaded, stand there on the grass on our side of the river, and wait for the Border Patrol to come down with a welcome wagon and say: Would you like to apply for asylum?

And, by the way, one of them was a pregnant lady, and so I am sure by now she has her asylum, or at least that baby is an American citizen.

Our borders are so porous that, in order to illustrate how bad they are, we had James O'Keefe, who went down and put on an Osama bin Laden mask and walked across the border. Nobody bothered him.

There was another individual that thought: I will make a bigger show of it. I will hire a mariachi band, and he rode a circus elephant across the Rio Grande River. That is how bad our border is.

Now, here is how bad our law and our Constitution are. The mariachi band was serenading the Supreme Court today, Mr. Speaker, to try to convince them that we ought to see the Supreme Court rewrite law that Congress has written, that has been signed by a previous President, and every President since then has taken the oath to take care that the laws be faithfully executed, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This constitutional balance that we have has seen a Supreme Court rewrite ObamaCare. So now they have the audacity to rewrite the law, and they are the ones that are deciding today, with eight Justices, sadly—sadly, not 9—as to whether or not the President of the United States can do what the Supreme Court did, in other words, rewrite the law.

The President of the United States, 22 times, as the previous speaker, Mr. BRAT, said, told America he doesn't have the constitutional authority to grant the amnesty, the executive amnesty that he did, whether it be DACA or whether it be DAPA. But then, after he deliberated for awhile, he checked his conscience. That didn't bother him. We shouldn't be amazed at that, Mr. Speaker. He already knew the Constitution. He lectured it to us. But what he checked was his politics, and his question was: Can he get away with it? Is there an enforcement capacity that could stop him?

Well, he hadn't met yet Judge Hanen in Texas who, if these Justices in the Supreme Court deadlock 4-4, the President's executive amnesty, at least for DAPA, is going to be stalled for the duration of his administration.

And so this prosecutorial discretion argument before the Court today that the Obama administration very well knew was the center of this case—and that prosecutorial discretion can be conferred on an individual basis only. That was the testimony of Janet Napolitano; and in the first Morton memo document, there were multiple references to an individual basis only. Her testimony was an individual basis only. But even the first document set out four categories, groups of people, whom the law would be waived for, and that is what we are talking about here.

Who writes the law? If the President writes the law, how could we write one that would restrain this President that is out of line? Let's preserve our Constitution, and let's look forward to an appointment to the Supreme Court that actually means it when they take their oath as we do ours.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from Iowa for such great remarks and your passion and your leadership. It was great to see you in front of the Supreme Court today speaking passionately about this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend from the great State of South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for doing this. I think it is such an important issue.

I think that, as has been mentioned by a couple of speakers now, what is really at play here is a constitutional issue. The Founding Fathers were so emphatically clear that there were to be three different pieces of pie. There was to be an executive branch that administered the law, a legislative branch that created it, and a judicial branch that interpreted it.

There is this amazing reservoir of common sense that exists out there with the American public. So what people told me back home is this is not about being against somebody from some other place. This is not about being against Hispanics. This is, in fact, about the rule of law and a system that our Founding Fathers gave us more than 200 years ago and how we preserve it. And how we preserve it is by actually sticking to it. Ultimately, the issue has less to do with immigration than it does to do with this larger notion of common sense and rule of law.

I would also stress the common sense part. I remember back in the O.J. Simpson trial, there was this whole notion of, if the glove doesn't fit, you can't acquit. In this case, the glove doesn't fit from the standpoint of common sense.

I actually had my staff pull up a couple of numbers this afternoon, and I think that they are fascinating, and here is what I mean by that. The num-

bers don't fit with the scale of every other amnesty that has been done for more than the last 50 years.

Think about this. The amnesties that this President has proposed, in total, are about 5½ million people. That is more than all of the cumulative amnesties for the last 53 years, going back all the way to the time of Eisenhower. In fact, the average amnesty was about 32,000 people in size.

We have all always been a Nation that has been welcoming; we have included other people. So if you look back at the El Salvadorans that Clinton and Bush allowed in, based on civic conflict and real civil war down that way, if you look at the Persian Gulf evacuees, if you look at the—my eyesight is getting so bad, I need to get glasses. If you look at the Chinese, after Tiananmen Square, if you were to look at Soviet refugees, if you look at the Ethiopians, the Lithuanians, even going back to the war orphans at the time of Eisenhower, there has been a remarkable case when amnesties were judged okay by this Congress, okay by the American people, okay by the President because of scale, 32,000 people, on average, per amnesty, for 53 years.

Again, this President's amnesty dwarfs the total amnesties of all Presidents over the last 53 years, and, for that reason, the American public has reacted as it has saying this just doesn't fit.

The other thing that I think is interesting, going back to the notion of sheer scale and the ways in which this particular amnesty that the President has proposed is at odds with every other for the last 53 years, is, if you were to add up the cumulative amnesties of this President, you would be in the top 20 States in the United States of America—5.5 million people. That is well above the population of South Carolina; it is well above the population of Alabama. Or go down about another 30 States, wherein you would have a de facto new State added that would be more than midway in the graph of all States in this country. It doesn't fit.

A third point that I would make, and I think this is a fascinating one that my staff pulled, is that if you look at all those amnesties I was just talking about over the last 53 years, they have really fallen into a couple of baskets, the one big amnesty being back in 1986 which, ultimately, went through this Congress. It was, in fact, as a consequence of the act of Congress and the will of the American public. That was a big one. But the other one was the Adjustment Act of 1966, which goes back to the plight of the Cuban people and trying to do something about that.

The other one has been a basket of natural disaster, of political strife, of family reunification. That has been a basket. And then there has been a basket for refugees. But never before have we had a basket that was about a political objective as opposed to a reaction

to an external event. We have had a long list of external events over 53 years that is at odds with what we see taking place.

So not only is this important from the standpoint of the Constitution and the rule of law, as has been so eloquently stated thus far, it is something that doesn't fit common sense from the standpoint of scale.

And there is one last point. There is a financial cost to this. The Cato Institute estimated that you are looking at about \$14,000 per household. If you multiply that times the number of refugees that the President is talking about here, you are looking at about \$19 billion in cost. That is about two-thirds of the dustup we have had over the budget. You are talking about \$30 billion. Is the number 1070 or 1040? A \$30 billion difference. In this case, two-thirds of that total would be taken care of just with this question of amnesty that is before us tonight which you, again, have brought, and I very, very much appreciate you doing so.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague from the great State of South Carolina for those—I mean, those are great numbers that really illustrate the significance and the large amount of numbers that we are dealing with.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the State of Arizona, Dr. PAUL GOSAR.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for his leadership on this issue and for organizing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken many times right here on the House Floor about upholding the rule of law. Whether it be about a lawless Attorney General who tried to cover up a gunrunning operation, or a rogue IRS Director illegally targeting innocent Americans, or a President attempting to enact amnesty by executive action, ensuring that the Federal Government is held accountable for its lawlessness has been one of my top priorities as an elected Representative to the people's House. And while the concept of equal application of the law may not seem like it needs any explanation, I would like to speak to the heart of why upholding the rule of law is so fundamental.

Our laws seek to incentivize Americans to behave responsibly and to impose consequences when they don't. This is the fundamental contract woven into the fabric of our Republic. It is a concept envisioned by our Founding Fathers, not only to protect the individual rights of every man, woman, and child, but also to prohibit executive overreach from an intrusive Federal Government.

Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis captured these principles best when he stated: "In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our Government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole

people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

Sadly, we are witnessing what happens when the Federal Government becomes a lawbreaker and breeds contempt for the law—anarchy. The Obama administration has created an immigration crisis as a result of its failure to enforce Federal immigration laws on the books.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service reported just last week that 2016 could set another record for the number of unaccompanied alien children crossing our southern border, and that from 2011 to 2014, unaccompanied alien children increased by 1,200 percent. Also last week, 1,000 Cuban aliens stormed the Costa Rica-Panama border demanding to pass so they could continue their journey to enter the United States illegally.

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives Congress clear jurisdiction on immigration matters, and President Obama's executive actions on immigration clearly infringe on that authority. The President even admitted that fact 22 times previously when he stated he did not have the authority to take the executive actions he ultimately ended up taking.

□ 2100

Justice Kennedy rightfully pointed out today that DAPA is a legislative act, not an administrative act. Thus, its creation is unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court should uphold the lower court's ruling that halted Obama's illegal actions.

What incentive do Americans have to follow the rule of law themselves if they have no faith that their government will do the same? How can lawmakers ask immigrants seeking to migrate lawfully to our country to follow these rules when this President so blatantly violates those same rules?

Unfortunately, if we don't take bold action now to hold the President accountable for his lawlessness, we risk permanently damaging the integrity of all our laws beyond all repair.

The good news is there is a solution. The House must utilize our power of the purse to block any and all funding for the President's executive amnesty orders.

I am attempting to do just that and recently spearheaded an appropriations rider supported by 35 of my colleagues to block funding for all executive actions on immigration dating back to 2011.

Returning to the rule of law begins with the House enforcing its own constitutional power of the purse. We must fundamentally reject the President's legacy of lawlessness and renew the faith that we all place in the rule of law.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague for such wise words of wisdom.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague from the State of Colorado, Mr. KEN BUCK.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration somehow missed the class in civics about separation of powers, checks and balances, and so many other issues from our Constitution. Thankfully, the Supreme Court can offer some remedial education when it decides the case *United States v. Texas*.

The facts of the case are simple. The President's executive action on immigration is downright illegal. He bypassed Congress, even though the Constitution explicitly states that the legislative branch has the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization.

This administration uses the excuse of prosecutorial discretion. As a prosecutor for 25 years, I can tell you this isn't true. When his executive order creates a new special class for millions of people in the United States, this isn't a case-by-case use of discretion. It is a blanket rulemaking, and it is rulemaking that directly contradicts the wishes of Congress.

All three branches of government agree that these actions are illegal. Courts have already issued an injunction against the rule.

Congress submitted a friend-of-the-court brief highlighting its proper role, and the President himself knows it would be unconstitutional to bypass Congress and create his own immigration laws. He said so many times. For some reason, he still went ahead and issued the executive order.

Real people feel real consequences when we put the Constitution through the paper shredder. The President's actions will lead to devastating new costs for States. Our healthcare system, our judicial and law enforcement systems, and our education system will all be strained as they try to accommodate the President's unconstitutional orders.

The judicial branch has a chance to stand up to executive overreach in this case and reassert congressional power. I hope the Court rules correctly because the fate of the Republic hangs in the balance.

Mr. YOHO. Words spoken so true, and I appreciate that. The Constitution and the sovereignty of this Nation is what is at stake here, along with the institution itself.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, Mr. JODY B. HICE from the State of Georgia.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. I am grateful to my colleague from Florida for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, today the United States Supreme Court heard oral arguments on what certainly has every potential of being one of the most important cases of our time. Of course, we are talking about a case involving an unprecedented and inexplicable expansion of powers by the President.

We all remember in November 2014 when President Obama, fresh from, I might add, losing midterm elections, announced his executive decision to

grant amnesty to some 5 million illegal immigrants.

Immediately 26 States, my home State of Georgia being one of them, quickly moved to challenge this President's decision in the courts.

Those States rightly and correctly argued that they were being forced by the Federal Government to bear the costly burden of this President's abuse of power.

So after months of legal wrangling in the lower courts, now we watch United States v. Texas being considered in the High Court.

We watched this being put on in the Supreme Court, and I am hopeful, as many of my colleagues, all of us here tonight, that the rulings from the lower courts will stand and that, ultimately, this President's executive amnesty will be ruled for what it is, a clear violation of the Constitution.

That is what we are dealing with tonight, a violation of the Constitution, specifically article II, section 3, the faithful execution clause.

Many ask: What is that? Basically, that clause requires the President to enforce the laws of the land. Is it too much to ask for the President to enforce the laws of the land as written by Congress and interpreted by the courts?

This President has turned that upside down. He has turned our Constitution on its head with his own legislative policies from the executive office and the abuse of executive authority.

Many of us here have voted multiple times to oppose many of the President's unconstitutional actions, and I have cosponsored many bills trying to deal specifically with his planned amnesty program.

Going forward, now we have the Supreme Court case before us, and we all hope that they will see that what the President has done is a direct, gross violation of our Constitution.

Again, I want to thank my friend from Florida, Congressman YOHO, for putting together this Special Order.

Mr. YOHO. I would like to thank my colleague from Georgia for participating.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, our institution of law is threatened more today than ever before. All evil or tyranny needs to succeed or for a constitutional republic to fail is for good men and women to be complacent and do nothing.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

#### ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friends, as led by our

friend, Congressman TED YOHO from Florida, and our friend from Georgia, Brother Hice. We heard great comments from Dr. GOSAR and our friend, STEVE KING, from Iowa.

These are deeply troubling times, and the Supreme Court taking up United States v. Texas really accentuates that issue. Sometimes it is nice to just pause and pay tribute to folks, for example, a beautiful couple here.

It is a pastor. His name is Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon and his wife, Maria Sabillon. They are with their granddaughter in this picture. They are a beautiful couple. You can feel the love emanating from the picture.

Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon was a Baptist minister at Nuevo Amanecer Baptist Church of Houston in the Cloverleaf area. He was an excellent carpenter. He owned a home remodeling business, J J & Sons Remodeling. His wife, Maria,—you can tell she loves her granddaughter—was a retired home caregiver for children with special needs. They were a beautiful couple.

Mr. Sabillon never accepted a salary from the church and instead relied upon his job as a carpenter to feed his family. So it appears that Pastor Sabillon was working and acting in the vein of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Particularly Paul didn't want to be a burden to others. So he made tents, sewed, and did whatever he needed to so that he wasn't a burden to others.

Instead of being a burden to others, Pastor Sabillon and his wife, Maria, were a blessing to Texas. They were a blessing to the Houston area and to so many whom they helped, the special needs kids that Maria helped with.

□ 2115

It appears that Jesse, Pastor Sabillon, was doing what Jesus said to do, to be a light to others, to be salt to the world, to administer to others' needs, or as Jesus told Peter, "If you love me, you will tend my flock." Well, Pastor Sabillon did that and, apparently, did that very well.

This story, April 15: "Alexis De Larosa Sosa, 21, is a Mexican national who entered the United States illegally, HCSO"—apparently Harris County Sheriff's Office—"public information officer Ryan Sullivan confirmed in a phone interview with Breitbart Texas.

"His intake"—by this he means, Alexis De Larosa Sosa—"form says: U.S. citizen, no; alien status, illegal . . . De Larosa Sosa was wanted in connection with a street racing crash where Pastor Jesse Estrada Sabillon, and his wife, Maria Sabillon, were killed. The couple was driving home Tuesday night after visiting their niece who had just given birth to a baby when they were struck by the truck.

"The suspect is reported to have fled the scene following the crash and did not turn himself in until Friday morning about 10 a.m. local time.

"He was allegedly driving a 2006 Chevy pickup truck and was said to be

racing with a dark-colored Dodge Challenger or Charger, the Houston Chronicle reported on Wednesday. The two vehicles were said to be racing along the Sam Houston Tollway feeder road when De Larosa Sosa is reported to have run a red light, striking the 2004 BMW 330 driven by Sabillon. The couple were both pronounced dead at the scene of the crash. De Larosa Sosa is said to have fled the scene on foot. The driver of the Dodge fled the scene in his vehicle.

"Officials with the Harris County Sheriff's Office quickly notified the family of the pastor who expressed relief at the news," talking about the apprehension of the suspect.

"De Larosa Sosa is currently processing into the Harris County jail and has not yet made a court appearance. He is expected to be charged in connection with the two homicides and fleeing the scene of the fatal accident."

We know there are some wonderful people who have come into this country illegally. There have been. But there is no question that criminals have taken advantage of the situation to cross our border, since it has been porous, and to inflict crime on people of the United States. There should be little doubt about that.

And then we have this story from the Washington Free Beacon: "Number of Children Illegally Crossing Border Up 1,200 Percent Between 2011 and 2014." Ironically, it just happens to be, as people were finding out south of our border and in other parts of the world, that if you make it into the United States illegally, then you are probably going to stay. Odds are 97 percent you will stay.

As border patrolmen have told me, drug cartels across our southern border call our Border Patrol, our Homeland Security, the logistics, and they laughingly say if they get people illegally into the country, then Homeland Security is the logistics that ships them wherever they want them to go in the country.

As I have seen a number of times in the middle of the night as people are being processed, and like, for example, the one older lady who was asked how much she paid, some would say \$6,000, some would say \$7,000, \$5,000, or \$8,000.

On a number of occasions, a border patrolman has challenged them: Where did you get that kind of money? You don't have that kind of money.

It normally took repeated questioning to elicit an answer: Well, I paid \$1,800 from family in this place, some people sent \$2,000 from the United States, and I am going to pay the rest by working it off in the United States.

They tell them where they want to go. Amazingly, Homeland Security has shipped people that have come into the country illegally all over the country. We have reports about Mexican drug distribution in all of our major cities. When you know that Homeland Security is shipping people that still owe the drug cartels money into different