our veterans and those serving in our U.S. military.

In addition, I believe that we need to relook at the H–1 visa program, the farmworker program. We need to acknowledge the reality that we have had for the last 150 years of agriculture here in the United States, which is that we rely on many of our immigrants coming from Mexico and Central and South America to help with our agriculture. This has been going on for over a century.

What we can do is simply go from a 1-year to maybe a 3-year or 5-year program. I know our immigrants' rights community would support it. I know our agriculture communities would support it; and we wouldn't have people unwittingly not getting back to their country of origin after the 1-year visa expires, when they just want to go back and come back again to help out as seasonal labor.

Then thirdly, there is an arbitrary cap on highly skilled workers here in this country. We train them in Ivy League schools, in brilliant schools in Texas, California, Florida, and across this Nation. And then, because of an arbitrary cap that no one wants to change because of the hot-button issue of immigration, then we send them on their way, back to their countries of origin, rather than keep them here and harness their talent for the future of our economy.

Canada has even got word of this and welcomes these folks. When they realize their visas are up, they beg them to come to Canada to help start new businesses.

So these are some of the ideas that we can fix, that we could all agree on, that both parties can agree on. And of course, in the end, we need a comprehensive immigration reform. But, in the meantime, let's get some things done that we all agree on and move our country forward.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii, one of the most beautiful States of the Union, for her leadership.

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for complimenting my State, but for, most importantly, again, putting a face and names to those who are suffering as a result of our broken immigration policy.

You know, for us here, we can stand here and talk about policies and debate them and talk about legislation that needs to be passed. But it is really those folks at home who make it all very real. It is not just a bill number, it is their own family that is being torn apart, it is their own children who are being affected.

Now, you know, I talked about Mr. Ortiz in Hawaii. He and his family are going through this, as we speak, where, in just a few days, he faces being deported. He and his family have exhausted all the options available to them, given the time that they have.

Our delegation from Hawaii, both my colleague, Congresswoman HANABUSA, as well as our Senators, Senator HIRONO and Senator SCHATZ, we have all sent a letter to Secretary Kelly, Department of Homeland Security, urging him to reconsider this order and to halt Mr. Ortiz's deportation, taking a consideration to him and his circumstance and his longstanding commitment and leadership in our community.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 2794, which is what is called a private bill, specifically for the relief of Andres Magana Ortiz. And the purpose of this bill is to help Mr. Ortiz with his extremely challenging situation and to help him on his own path to citizenship.

I urge Chairman GOODLATTE to give positive consideration to this bill that has been referred to his committee. I urge Secretary Kelly, the Department of Homeland Security, to revisit their policy and their decision and to put a halt on Mr. Ortiz's deportation. He is not just a number. He is not just a statistic. He and his family are facing this reality today.

It is always the right time to do the right thing, and I urge these leaders to do that right thing.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor to be here. I do greatly appreciate my friend from Hawaii, her views. I know she is a person of integrity; calls them like she sees them. I appreciate her very much.

There are just a number of things that really need to be called out. Here is an article from the Guardian. Julian Borger, June 6, that would be yesterday. The headline is: ''Cancel Donald Trump state visit, says Sadiq Khan, after London attack tweets.''

It states: ''London mayor says U.S. President is wrong about many things and that state visit to Britain should not go ahead.

''The London mayor, Sadiq Khan, has called on the British Government to cancel a planned state visit by Donald Trump after being criticized in two tweets by the U.S. President.''

Now, it really is interesting that the London mayor, after he has his citizens—his people are viciously mutilated, killed in the streets of his city, and, instead of being—going through a self-examination, is there something more I could have done as mayor of this town? Is there something more I could have encouraged? Is there something more we could have done here in England, in Great Britain, in the U.K.? Is there something we could have done that I, in a position of authority, could have done to stop this, to help, at least help stop this?

But Mr. Sadiq Khan apparently didn't go through that, as people were grieving, not just in London but all over the world, here in the United States, praying for the families, grieving with those who were attacked, so many attacked, dozens attacked, instead of perhaps wondering, maybe we don't have our policies quite right, this is yet another attack, and maybe the Britain leaders should have thought, you know, we have been saying that the real key—it has been said around Europe, maybe the real key to stopping radical Islam and the mutilation of innocent people, the slashing of throats, the beheading, the terrible things that have been done by radical Islamists, maybe the way to stop them we were told—not maybe—they said the way to stop them is the Paris climate accord.

If we just show them enough love as they are beheading us, or slashing our throats, and we have signed on, and we are fully part embraced in the Paris climate accord, you know, the radical Islamist murders will stop. That is the kind of baloney we have been told.

And in England, there are people who have indicated as much, how outrageous it was that President Trump pulled the United States out of the Paris accord, because he saw the damage that was going to be done to the United States economy. He saw the damage that would be done to the United States jobs.

I talked to people in east Texas last weekend, different places around east Texas, and they kept coming back: I am so grateful that Donald Trump pulled out of the Paris accord. One of them has a new—some type of concrete business. They have got rights to a specific process that is great for the environment. It is green.

So then we find out our business was going to be devastated if we stayed in the Paris climate accord. It would have gutted our business. We would have been having to file for bankruptcy. Others, you know, the same day, last Saturday, were telling me the same things, different places, same song. We found out how much our business would have been gutted if the President had not pulled out of the Paris accord.

And, of course, we want to be fair to the 160 countries or so that have condemned the United States, said that we are the one partner in the Paris climate accord, just like in Kyoto, and Reykjavik, and all these others, the United States is the most important partner in those accords. Well, yeah, I guess so.

We were going to be the one country that was going to pay billions of dollars to other countries because we have been successful, and we have been innovative, and our Constitution, the brilliance of the Founders to ensure in our Constitution that we were going to reward intellectual property, intellectual thought, would stir intellectual creations. And we loved this idea of private property, you know, before the

last 50 years, we loved this idea of private property, and the Nation has grown.

But as, you know, people have continued to make inroads, taking away private property rights, of course, the economy doesn't grow at the rates that it has in previous days. But at least by pulling out of Paris, we have got a shot to continue to be the most humanitarian, the most charitable Nation, I believe, in the history of the world; that even Solomon's Israel did not have the kind of freedoms and the kind of individual ability to be charitable.

Billions of dollars that have been given. I don't know. Maybe trillions over the years in today's dollars around the world for so many good purposes. And yet if we had stayed in the Paris accord, we would have done so much damage to our own economy.

So I have told many people, thank God, and thank Donald Trump that he got us out of that mess, so that we can continue our climb out of the economic malaise of the Obama years; that we can continue to get back a thriving economy that has been so sluggish for so many years now; not the artificial growth bubble that was created late in the Clinton years, that was bound to burst, not that kind but based on real jobs and manufacturing jobs coming back.

I know from studying history, I think President Trump knows just from his business acumen, that any nation that is considered an international world power, that cannot produce and manufacture the things that are needed in a time of war will not remain a world power past the next war. It won't. So it brings us back to a great thing to get rid of the Paris accord.

Now we have got to cut taxes. And I know there is a lot of screaming from the left about how, gee, wanting to cut taxes for the rich. Well, actually, under President Obama, there was so much damage done to the middle classes. The middle class shrunk in numbers of people, it appears, while the gap between the poor and the rich got even bigger. And as President Obama is on video admitting, it must have been tough, but he admitted, yeah, it is true. It was true.

It is true that, under President Obama, for the first time in the history of the United States of America, first time, 95 percent of the Nation's income went to the top 1 percent. So we have heard all this stuff about Republicans helping the rich and hurting the poor.

There is no President's policy in the history of our Nation that has done more damage to the poor, to the middle class, than the policies of the Obama administration. There is no President's administration that has done more damage to shrink the middle class and to widen the gap between the poor and the rich. And most of those rich who give money seem to just keep giving to the Democratic Party.

□ 1800

You know, I love, whether it is Republicans, Democrats, or Independents coming up with a great idea and making money on it. It is fantastic. You know, as long as it is legal, but it is fantastic.

With all of my faults, jealousy is not one I suffer from. It is great to see anybody work hard or come up with something innovative, and make money. I think it is fantastic. I love the fact that this Nation, for most of our history, has done what we could to incentivize that process.

So the mayor of London condemning President Trump.

Well, who is this guy?

He has got plenty of his own problems. He has got plenty of his own issues. But it wasn't just the mayor of London, Mr. Sadiq Khan. We also heard from the Acting U.S. Ambassador over in London, Lewis Lukens, and he sent out this message: ''I commend the strong leadership of the mayor of London as he leads the city forward after this heinous attack.''

And by virtue of this statement, of course, he is incorporating the decisions by the mayor of London, the decisions by those with whom the mayor of London is consorting, those decisions that have allowed so many radical Islamists to be creating plots and plans to kill Londoners. That has been going on, we find out after this attack. We should have known from the one before, the one before, the one before, that this has been going on.

Lewis Lukens, our highest U.S. ranking official in London, basically condemned President Trump by siding with the mayor of London, who is more concerned about condemning the President of the United States than he is about grieving for his own people, or doing everything within the mayor's conceivable power to stop the next radical attack.

Under the thinking of people like the mayor of London, there should not have ever been an attack in England, not recently, for sure, because they didn't pull out of the Paris accord. And if the Paris accord was going to save the world from radical Islam, then, wow, all of the attacks should be happening in the United States of America.

Unless we get our friends on the other side of the aisle to help us as we need to do to pass legislation that give us the protection we need, the attacks will be coming. But it wouldn't make sense—if you believe people like this, and those that say Paris is the key to ending radical Islam, it wouldn't make sense that London would be hit twice instead of the United States. They didn't pull out. They condemned us for pulling out.

So it makes you think, when you really look at everything, maybe the key to defeating radical Islam is what Americans who have fought them know: there is only one way to defeat radical Islam, and that is to defeat it; to fight it, kill it, defeat it.

I saw President Carter here on television here in the last few days. I had it on mute, so I don't know what he said. A sweet man. Of course, he does seem to have some pretty strong anti-Semitic feelings, so it is hard to feel too much about the sweetness when you see and hear comments that make you know he really doesn't care much for certain Jews or Israel. But I know he meant well when he abandoned the Shah of Iran, not a nice man like Qadhafi—not a great man, not a nice man, but at least he was keeping radical Islam in the box, keeping it boxed up.

When President Carter saw the Shah deposed and the Ayatollah Khomeini comes into Iran, he didn't recognize that he had literally opened Pandora's box, and it was going to be a plague upon the world for years and years to come, and that thousands and thousands of Americans would die trying to put radical Islam back in the box from which President Carter let it escape and from which President Obama encouraged more—not intentionally, but the actions have consequences, and Americans have continued to die and will continue until radical Islam, with the help of our Muslim friends that don't want to be ruled by radical Islamists, with their help—we have got to have their help—we can get it back in the box the way it once was.

But there are people like Lewis Lukens, our highest ranking U.S. official in London, who don't recognize this. But the name to so many sounded familiar, Lewis Lukens. I know I have heard that name before. Oh, well, after tweeting out, or sending out the message from the U.S. Embassy in London, taking sides in favor of the mayor of London over the President of the United States—let's see, who is this—as the article from Monica Showalter says:

''So who is Acting Ambassador Lewis Lukens anyway?

''Turns out he's a career diplomat, with nearly 30 years' experience in assorted outposts. His most prominent positions, however, have been at the side of the person who must have served as a sort of mentor, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, serving as her chief administrative officer. In that time frame, he managed to reach the inner circle of Clinton's tight little circle of acolytes—on the same level as Cheryl Mills and Huma Abedin.

''In testimony to Congress, Lukens claimed to have come up with the idea of having Clinton set up a private server.''

Oh, that is right. He is the genius that came up with the idea of having Hillary Clinton have a private server so it was more easy for our enemies to hack classified information. But then again, we find out, well, it really didn't make that much difference because she was sending it to Huma Abedin, who was sending it to Mr. Weiner.

Anyway, it turns out, all kinds of felonies were being committed, Federal laws being violated. Of course, under Director Comey, he didn't want to pursue anybody like that because he is

sure they meant well, even though they were violating the law right and left.

But Lukens takes the side of the mayor, and he is the same guy that came up with the private server idea for Hillary Clinton. So I know, on behalf of those who supported President Trump, we greatly appreciate the damage that he did to the Democratic Party. Lukens—and, hopefully, he won't be long for being the highest ranking U.S. official in London. Hopefully, we can send somebody over there that doesn't have great ideas like he had for Hillary Clinton that causes our British friends the kind of trouble he caused for Hillary Clinton.

And then we have got this from Will Carr, WGMD News Radio:

''Concerns are being raised on Capitol Hill about whether partisan politics could impact the 2020 Census and swing congressional redistricting in favor of Democrats.

''FOX News has learned that last summer, a pro-Democratic analytics firm that described itself as 'a platform for hope and change'. . . .''

Wow. Yeah, as we saw over the last 8 years, 95 million Americans—the highest number in our history—even gave up looking for work. So they weren't reflected in the unemployment numbers, but they just gave up. It was so hopeless. So much for hope and change.

Anyway, this analytics firm is ''a platform for hope and change,'' but it '' . . . included as a subcontractor in a $415 million advertising contract for the 2020 Census.

''The data firm, Civis Analytics, was founded by the chief analytics officer on former President Barack Obama's 2012 reelection campaign.

''Since congressional redistricting, which occurs every 10 years, is based on the results of the national Census, the chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee is now asking the Secretary of the Department of Commerce to ensure that the Census will be conducted in a nonpartisan fashion—and that redistricting will not be impacted.

'' 'In 2016, the Bureau awarded an advertising contract that included a subcontractor with close ties to the partisan politics that reportedly ''spun out of'' the reelection campaign of President Obama,' Senator RON JOHNSON''—our friend from Wisconsin—''wrote to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross in a letter obtained by FOX News.''

Our friend, Senator RON JOHNSON, says: ''This partisan lineage raises concern in light of a Democratic initiative to use the results of the 2020 Census to draw district lines in a manner favorable to Democratic candidates.''

So, wow, what a deal. The Obama administration has got their own consulting firm helping with the 2020 Census. That ought to concern a lot of people that want to make sure that our little experiment as a democratic republic does not come to an end. As Ben Franklin warned, we could have it as long—if we could keep it, that is.

But the shocking story today that I am not hearing enough talk about, and printed out by Circa, John Solomon and Sara Carter today: ''A former U.S. intelligence contractor tells Circa he walked away. . . .''

This is a U.S. intelligence contractor.

Where have we heard that term?

That is what we were told that Edward Snowden was.

Well, this says: ''. . . he walked away with more than 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives from the National Security Agency and the CIA, a haul potentially larger than Edward Snowden's now infamous breach.''

But it sounded like a good thing.

It says: ''And now he is suing former FBI Director James Comey and other government figures, alleging the Bureau has covered up evidence that he provided them showing widespread spying on Americans that violated civil liberties.

''The suit, filed late Monday night by Dennis Montgomery, was assigned to the same Federal judge who has already ruled that some of the NSA's collection of data on Americans violates the U.S. Constitution's Fourth Amendment, setting up an intriguing legal proceeding in the Nation's Capital this summer.

''Montgomery says the evidence he gave to the FBI chronicle the warrantless collection''—not just phone metadata—''of phone, financial and personal data and the unmasking of identities in spy data about millions of Americans.

'' 'This domestic surveillance was all being done on computers supplied by the FBI,' Montgomery told Circa in an interview. 'So these supercomputers, which are FBI computers, the CIA is using them to do domestic surveillance.' ''

□ 1815

Gee, we have been assured that does not happen. We have been assured in hearings in our Judiciary Committee over the last 12 years I have been here—and we have had a lot of hearings on these issues. We have been assured this isn't happening. This guy who knows enough to steal 600 million classified documents on 47 hard drives without getting caught says it is happening.

Mr. Speaker, let me parenthetically insert here, we have had a number of conversations with FBI and different intelligence officials, because section 702 that allows this kind of widespread collection, if we are going after what we were told would be foreign terrorists, known foreign terrorists, and they happened to capture an American, the name is masked. You can't get that information. There has to be probable cause to get anything about the American. We are finding out names have been unmasked.

Now, this information by Montgomery is that things are leaked about Americans. Widespread information is being collected on Americans with no probable cause they committed any crime.

I have told numerous DOJ and intelligence officials—and I am very serious about this—they must show that they can police their own ranks of people who are violating Americans' civil rights and gathering information in ways Orwell could never have dreamed of. As my friend THOMAS MASSIE was pointing out today, Orwell thought it would take people to spy on other people. He never dreamed that we, the government, would be able to collect warehouses full of information on little disks that would be used and pulled out later any time they wanted to go after an individual—but it sure looks like it is happening.

If our own justice and intelligence officials cannot police themselves and produce the very people who have leaked information and who have unmasked information, I will join with many of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle to vote against them ever having those types of powers again. They are going to have to police themselves. They are going to have to produce the people who have been leaking, who have been unmasking, and who have been spying on Americans without legal authority. They are going to have to produce those people, because if they can't and if they don't, they have no business having this kind of power. I know it has got a lot of our justice officials and intelligence officials upset.

Based on the way things have been going and from what we keep finding out, I am sure somebody has been going through my background with a fine-tooth comb looking for anything so they can take me out, but good luck.

I am sure, as Heritage Foundation has written before, probably most Americans are committing a number of Federal crimes a day we don't even know about. So, apparently, it can be done if Heritage is right, as I think they are. But the fact is it ought to scare every American that there is this much Federal intervention in their own personal lives.

The truth is we have got to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. They have no right and they have no authority under our Constitution to gather people's financial information unless there is probable cause to believe a crime has been committed and that this person has committed the crime, and then get a warrant to get it. It is time to end that for real. It is time to end this kind of personal snooping on American citizens.

This article goes on and says: ''Documents obtained by Circa outside of the lawsuit show that the U.S. Attorney's Office in Washington in 2015 approved a grant of limited immunity for Montgomery so he could explain how he managed to walk out of his contract and the buildings he worked in with

the classified material'' on 47 hard drives.

''He said he returned the hard drives to the FBI, a fact confirmed in government documents reviewed by Circa.

'' 'They're doing this domestic surveillance on Americans, running a project on U.S. soil,' Montgomery alleged. He did not disclose the classified name of the project but said he revealed all aspects of the project during his interview with the FBI.

'' 'Can you imagine what someone can do with the information they were collecting on Americans, can you imagine that kind of power.'

''Officials with the FBI and CIA declined to comment due to current and pending litigation.

''The FBI contacts with Montgomery were encouraged by a senior status Federal judge who encouraged the two sides to meet rather than allow for any of the classified materials to leak, according to interviews Circa conducted.

''Montgomery's lawsuit, which included his lawyer, the well-known conservative activist Larry Klayman, alleges Montgomery provided extensive evidence to the FBI of illegal spying on Americans ranging from judges to businessmen like the future President Donald Trump.

''The suit did not offer specifics on any illegal spying, but it accused the Bureau of failing to take proper actions to rectify Montgomery's concerns.

''Montgomery divulged to the FBI a 'pattern and practice of conducting illegal, unconstitutional surveillance against millions of Americans, including prominent Americans such as the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court' ''—wow—'' 'other Justices, 156 judges, prominent businessmen, and others such as Donald J. Trump, as well as plaintiffs themselves.' ''

That is the allegation in the suit.

'' 'Plaintiffs were assured that the FBI, under Defendant Comey, would conduct a full investigation into the grave instances of illegal and unconstitutional activity set forth by Montgomery. However, the FBI, on Defendant Comey's orders, buried the FBI's investigation because the FBI itself is involved in an ongoing conspiracy to not only conduct the aforementioned illegal, unconstitutional surveillance, but to cover it up as well,' the suit added.

''Klayman and Montgomery also alleged that they have evidence that they themselves have been improperly spied upon by U.S. intelligence. The suit named numerous other defendants as well, including NSA Director Mike Rogers, former CIA Director John Brennan, and even former President Barack Obama.

''Court records indicate the suit was assigned in Washington to U.S. District Judge Richard Leon, who in 2015 issued an historic ruling that the NSA's past bulk collection of Americans' phone records most likely violated the Constitution.''

Thank God he ruled as he did.

''The agency has since ended that practice but the pending case, which is winding its way through appeals and motions, is likely to shine a light on whether Americans' civil liberties were violated during more than a decade of the war on terror.''

This is incredible.

Then, when we hope the courts may be our help, we see another answer that is incredibly discouraging, Federal courts stepping in where they have no authority. Federal court, district court, court of appeals, they have no authority to grant standing to people that are not in the United States, standing and rights to people that are not American citizens and not on American soil. But that is the effect of what they are doing when they say that the President and, actually, Congress, which gave the President much of the power he has on the issue of travel bans and immigration, that we don't have the authority.

Well, under the Constitution, we do have the authority. Congress has the authority and the President has authority to protect us when it comes to national security. He has authority to make decisions like he has. There is no constitutional right under the United States Constitution for someone in another country to have a right to come into the United States. There is no such constitutional right.

For any harebrained judge in America to say that indicates that this is like artificial intelligence becoming self-aware: Wow, I can do whatever I want.

Once it becomes like AI, once it becomes self-aware, then it begins to protect itself. Anyone who has authority or ability to rein them in: We have got to slap them down and limit their ability to rein us in with our artificial intelligence—which is more than some of the judges have.

Mr. Speaker, I am not singling out an individual so I am not violating the House rules.

But this is serious. This is a blow to our experiment as a little, self-governing republic. It is a threat to our ability to proceed as such.

But every Federal court except for the Supreme Court owes its entire existence and jurisdiction to the United States Congress. Congress brings those courts into being, and we can take them out. Congress gives them their jurisdiction, and we can take them out.

I think it is time to begin to take out some of these courts that, like artificial intelligence, have become self-aware and now are trying to lash out and take power away from those under our Constitution that have it and to take it unto themselves in a self-protection mode.

It is getting dangerous in the United States of America for a number of reasons. Radical Islam is only one of the reasons, but courts are going so far to overrule common sense and overrule the words of the Constitution and overrule the words of lawfully passed bills in the House and the Senate signed by Presidents and approved in other case law.

Courts are coming back now and just deciding: We are like artificial intelligence. We are most important now that we are self-aware as the courts, and we are going to do everything we can to limit congressional authority and executive authority and bring all power and protection unto ourselves in the courts.

It is getting dangerous from a constitutional standpoint. All of this is occurring.

There is an article from Conservative Review by Daniel Horowitz, June 5: ''7th Circuit Codifies Transgenderism into the Constitution.''

The courts did such a great thing in America pointing out the importance of immutable characteristics. Characteristics that are immutable are not changeable, whether it is the color of the skin, a race, or a gender. Things that are immutable need to be protected from discrimination.

Once the courts began to get into protecting characteristics that change on the whim of the carrier of those characteristics, then the courts started getting us into an area that also is a threat to a constitutional republic with private property rights, with privacy rights, and with the freedoms that we used to have and that are being infringed.

When the courts come back and say that you have to protect non-immutable characteristics that may change day to day wholly in the mind of the proponent, where does it stop?

□ 1830

It is a destructive force. We all agreed on race, everybody I know. I am sure there are some racists in America. In fact, I know there are still some. We have got some people who, I can't believe, after the lessons that should have been learned from the Holocaust, hate Jews, hate Israel, want it destroyed, removed. Incredible.

The courts are saying we have to preserve some right that none of the rest of us can know, some characteristic none of the rest of us can know. It could change moment by moment. One moment someone is saying: I feel like a girl; I am going in the girl's restroom; or I feel like a boy today.

Who can know? If it is not apparent, then how can somebody be said to be bigoted against or take some action against when you couldn't even know what was in their head? How did I know?

I didn't discriminate against somebody for something I didn't know they had. It was all in their mind. How can I know? When the courts get us into that kind of quagmire, we can't recover. It will sink our ship.

In this case, as Daniel Horowitz says:

''Last week, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals became the latest Federal appeals court to codify

transgenderism into law and the Constitution.

''Although Obama's executive mandates for transgender bathrooms have gone by the wayside, thanks to Attorney General Jeff Sessions overruling the liberal whims of Education Secretary Betsy DeVos, the courts are engaging in their own social transformation on behalf of the defeated Democrats.

''In Whitaker v. Kenosha Unified School District, a unanimous opinion from the three-judge panel ordered a Wisconsin school district to allow a girl to use the boys' bathroom in school. Following in the footsteps of the Sixth and Fourth Circuits, this Seventh Circuit panel, which included GOP-appointee Ilana Rovner, ruled that the 1972 title IX education law and the 14th Amendment's Equal Protection Clause cover transgenderism as a protected class.

''As the courts redefine our national sovereignty, rewrite election laws and redistricting in favor of Democrats, redefine criminal justice law for mass murderers, and mandate publicly funded abortions, they are using their self-acclaimed status as kings to redefine sexuality retroactive to laws and amendments codified long before the sexual-identity movement was in vogue.

''In an emotional screed disguised as law, this opinion uses male pronouns to describe a woman with female parts. In any other era, these judges would have been deemed mentally unstable to serve on a bench.

''While refusing to recognize biological sex as immutable—or, even significant—the court contended that there is absolutely no disruption or privacy concerns over opposite sexes using the wrong bathrooms:

''A transgender student's presence in the restroom provides no more of a risk to other students' privacy rights than the presence of an overly curious student of the same biological sex who decides to sneak glances at his or her classmates performing their bodily functions.

''The court then appealed to common sense to disregard any remaining privacy concerns as 'conjecture and abstraction.'

''Why is it I have a sneaking suspicion that when title IX was drafted in 1972, much less when the 14th Amendment was drafted in 1867, they completely understood the privacy concerns but would have never fathomed judges maniacally referring to a Y chromosome as an X chromosome?

''Amazingly, the legal liberals are the ones with the hypocritical arguments, even according to their own twisted logic. How could this school district be guilty of violating equal protection and engaging in stereotyping for actually applying science equally, and not going along with the deliberate stereotyping requested by the plaintiff?

''There is no greater stereotype than saying that a girl, despite being a girl, should be treated like a boy because she acts out in a 'manly' way. The entire sexual-identity movement is built upon the very sex stereotypes they want to codify into law but also protect from discrimination.

''This is part of a broader hypocrisy in which the transgender lobby is filing lawsuits to apply disability laws to gender-confused individuals, but, on the other hand, are suing on discrimination grounds for stereotyping and recognizing this 'disability' as a disability and not as a natural phenomenon.

''Either way, the courts will always reach the legal conclusion that best promotes the socially licentious political outcome . . . even when the 'jurisprudence' is contradictory.

''Last year, the Fourth and Sixth Circuits said that transgenderism being codified into civil rights and the Constitution is 'settled law,' demonstrating how irremediably broken the courts are. This is not just the Ninth Circuit; we have yet to find a single circuit willing to understand the most immutable laws of nature. Thus, it is not surprising that almost every court is creating a right for Somalis to immigrate. If marriage and human sexuality are subjective, so are the borders of a nation.

''Although the Supreme Court punted the Fourth Circuit case, Grimm v. Gloucester County, because that one was built upon Obama's obsolete transgender mandate, it is quite clear that another case will end up before the high court within the next year.

''Given Justice Anthony Kennedy's history on this issue—and his penchant for being influenced by growing momentum in the lower courts and the legal profession—it's fairly safe to say we will be confronted with the transgender version of Obergefell in the near future.

''The transgender case comes just 2 months after the Seventh Circuit codified sexual orientation into Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.''

That is a court passing legislation illegally, unconstitutionally, just by fiat by the court. Their signature, just like any good oligarch.

''This circuit, like many others, is drifting more and more to the far left. A number of the GOP appointees, such as Richard Posner and Ilana Rovner, are among the worst offenders.

''There are only two reliable originalists on the court, Michael Kanne and Diane Sykes. That is why it is so important for Trump to immediately fill the two vacancies on the court with known originalists. Even more importantly, this is yet one more reason to make the courts less consequential by reforming their jurisdiction and scope of power.''

And I would add, taking them out. If they are that irresponsible, let's take them out.

What they refuse to look at is real science—real medical science. That is exactly what Dr. Paul McHugh did. He published this article in The Wall Street Journal on May 13, 2016. It was updated, apparently, from June 12, 2014.

This was the head of psychiatry, Dr. Paul McHugh, at Johns Hopkins Hospital, the first hospital in America to have actually carried out sex-change operations in America.

These were liberal, far-thinking, far-reaching ideas within surgery at Johns Hopkins. Well, yes, we can cut off organs, change their sexuality. Dr. Paul McHugh was head of psychiatry at Johns Hopkins.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOHMERT. Dr. McHugh is a man who knows the medical science, not some idea that fleets by that may be gone tomorrow about someone's sexuality.

Dr. McHugh says:

''The transgendered suffer a disorder of 'assumption' like those in other disorders familiar to psychiatrists. With the transgendered, the disordered assumption is that the individual differs from what seems given in nature—namely one's maleness or femaleness. Other kinds of disordered assumptions are held by those who suffer from anorexia and bulimia nervosa, where the assumption that departs from physical reality is the belief by the dangerously thin that they are overweight.''

He goes on and says:

''With body dysmorphic disorder, an often socially crippling condition, the individual is consumed by the assumption 'I'm ugly.' These disorders occur in subjects who have come to believe that some of their psycho-social conflicts or problems will be resolved if they can change the way that they appear to others. Such ideas work like ruling passions in their subjects' mind and tend to be accompanied by a solipsistic argument.

''For the transgendered, this argument holds that one's feeling of 'gender' is a conscious, subjective sense that, being in one's mind, cannot be questioned by others. The individual often seeks not just society's tolerance of this 'personal truth' but affirmation of it. Here rests the support for 'transgender equality,' the demands for government payment for medical and surgical treatments, and for access to all sex-based public roles and privileges.''

He goes on and says:

''We at Johns Hopkins University—which in the 1960s was the first American medical center to venture into 'sex-reassignment surgery'—launched a study in the 1970s comparing the outcomes of transgendered people who had the surgery with the outcomes of those who did not. Most of the surgically treated patients described themselves as 'satisfied' by the results, but their subsequent psycho-social adjustments were no better than those who didn't have the surgery. And so at Hopkins we

stopped doing sex-reassignment surgery, since producing a 'satisfied' but still troubled patient seemed an inadequate reason for surgically amputating normal organs.

''It now appears that our long-ago decision was a wise one. A 2011 study at the Karolinska Institute in Sweden produced the most illuminating results yet regarding the transgendered, evidence that should give advocates pause,'' including the courts that think that they can see a fleeting thought in a litigant's mind and say, Oh, there is a fleeting thought, that is an immutable characteristic. Therefore, we are going to give it rights, even though we can't see it, we don't know what it is. We have just got some idea, so we will call it an immutable characteristic.

But according to the Karolinska Institute study—which is a long-term study, and, for 30 years, they followed 324 people who had sex-reassignment surgery.

''The study revealed that beginning about 10 years after having the surgery, the transgendered began to experience increasing mental difficulties. Most shockingly, their suicide mortality rose almost twentyfold above the comparable nontransgender population. This disturbing result has as yet no explanation but probably reflects the growing sense of isolation reported by the aging transgendered after surgery. The high suicide rate certainly challenges the surgery prescription.''

Some of these Federal judges don't realize they are contributing to problems of indescribable proportions that may not be known, as the study indicated, for 10 years or so.

As Dr. McHugh points out:

''Another subgroup consists of young men and women susceptible to suggestion from 'everything is normal' sex education, amplified by internet chat groups. These are the transgender subjects most like anorexia nervosa patients: They become persuaded that seeking a drastic physical change will banish their psycho-social problems. 'Diversity' counselors in their schools, rather like cult leaders, may encourage these young people to distance themselves from their families and offer advice on rebutting arguments against having transgender surgery. Treatments here must begin with removing the young person from the suggestive environment and offering a countermessage in family therapy.''

□ 1845

''Then there is this subgroup of very young, often prepubescent children who notice distinct sex roles in the culture and, exploring how they fit in, begin imitating the opposite sex. Misguided doctors at medical centers including Boston's Children's Hospital have begun trying to treat this behavior by administering puberty-delaying hormones to render later sex-change surgeries less onerous—even though the drugs stunt the children's growth and risk causing sterility. Given that close to 80 percent of such children would abandon their confusion and grow naturally into adult life if untreated, these medical interventions come close to child abuse.''

And that is basically what these Federal courts are contributing to. As Dr. McHugh says, they come close to child abuse themselves. He didn't say that about the courts; that is my insertion. But as Dr. McHugh, after being open to helping the transgendered every way that was available, he bases his decision on science, on medical science, on study, not on some whim of someone with a fleeting idea in their mind, maybe it lasts for decades, maybe it doesn't.

But Dr. McHugh says: ''A better way to help these children: with devoted parenting.''

It is not taking them away by the government or some busybody leftwing kooks that think they know better than their own parents. Of course there are parents that aren't fit. I have sentenced some to prison, and I hope some of them never get out of prison. They are a danger. But for heaven's sake, let's allow good parenting.

Dr. McHugh says and finishes: ''At the heart of the problem is confusion over the nature of the transgendered. 'Sex change' is biologically impossible.''

Those are Dr. McHugh's words: ''Sex change is biologically impossible.''

He says: ''People who undergo sex-reassignment surgery do not change from men to women or vice versa. Rather, they become feminized men or masculinized women. Claiming that this is civil rights matter and encouraging surgical intervention is in reality to collaborate with and promote a mental disorder.''

That is what our Federal courts are engaging in. They are promoting a mental disorder, as it has been called in the DSM.

We ought to be about helping these people, not dividing America. But as the studies have indicated, 80 percent of these children that have such ideas, as others have said and he has said, how many of us know girls that were tomboys growing up but ended up being some of the most beautiful and feminine women later. Some may say that is sexist, but there are men who may grow up acting feminized and they grow up to be some of the most handsome, beautiful men you would ever know, but quite masculine.

These courts are not helping. They are playing with the latest fad, and their playing is doing massive destructive damage to our United States Constitution, to our court system, to our freedom, and to what is left of our Republic.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ADERHOLT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a family emergency.

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for June 6 and the balance of the week on account of attending his son's graduation.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 2:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a medical procedure.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1515. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Ceiling Fans [Docket No.: EERE-2012-BT-STD-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD28) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1516. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Dedicated-Purpose Pool Pumps [EERE-2015-BT-STD-0008] (RIN: 1904-AD52) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1517. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Residential Central Air Conditioners and Heat Pumps [EERE-2014-BT-STD-0048] (RIN: 1904-AD37) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1518. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's confirmation of effective date and compliance date for direct final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products [EERE-2011-BT-STD-0043] (RIN: 1904-AC51) received May 31, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec.