

community in Pennsylvania's Ninth Congressional District. I commend Pro-Life Berks for their dedication.

HONORING THOSE WHO STRUGGLE WITH MENTAL ILLNESS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of every American who has ever struggled with mental illness.

With May being National Mental Health Awareness Month as well as National Nurses Month, we recommit ourselves to:

Building better futures for those struggling with a mental health condition;

Supporting research into diagnoses and treatment;

Erasing the stigma around seeking help; and

Removing barriers to high-quality and timely mental healthcare by educating and training doctors, nurses, and behavioral specialists dedicated to these disabling conditions.

Our Nation is also battling an epidemic of veteran suicide. Tragically, over 7,000 veterans die by suicide every year, more than the total number of American servicemembers killed in action during the entire Global War on Terrorism.

It is no coincidence that our Nation is short 100,000 neuropsychiatrists and 500,000 advance practice nurses in these fields. At the VA alone, today, there are nearly 50,000 medical vacancies.

If we are to make progress, then our country, our Nation, must support investments in educating these physicians and nurses to treat those who, every day, look for a better way of life.

I look forward to partnering with Members of Congress to help America treat these illnesses and create a more humane society for all.

REPUBLICANS HAVE NO PLAN TO IMPROVE HEALTH CARE

(Mr. CASTEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 986, the Protecting Americans with Preexisting Conditions Act.

I was proud to vote in favor of H.R. 986 yesterday to rescind the Trump administration's dangerous effort to weaken lifesaving protections for people with preexisting conditions under the Affordable Care Act.

The Trump administration has been obsessed and relentless about undoing the historic and meaningful gains made under the ACA. Here, that means undermining the stability of the healthcare market and allowing States to promote junk, so-called short-term, limited-duration insurance options that directly discriminate against people with preexisting conditions.

Let us not forget that before the ACA, a woman's gender was, in effect,

a preexisting condition. One-third of women who tried to buy health plans on their own were either turned down or charged a higher premium.

Republicans have no plan to improve healthcare, only to roll back the progress made in the ACA, putting the health coverage of the 52 million Americans with preexisting conditions in jeopardy.

I am proud of the progress that this House has made to protect Americans' health coverage, and I look forward to continuing action to expand access and lower healthcare costs.

TRUMP ADMINISTRATION REFUSES RULE

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to condemn the Trump administration's dangerous final rule that allows healthcare workers to discriminate against patients based on their personal beliefs.

Too often, healthcare in this country is riddled with inequality, and while Democrats in the House are working to address this, the administration is trying to make it worse.

This policy will be most harmful to our sisters of color who often live in areas with hospitals that may refuse comprehensive reproductive healthcare, including abortion and birth control.

Refusals have already threatened the life of women with pregnancy complications. This rule could make the maternal mortality crisis among African American women even worse.

This is yet another attempt by the Trump administration to impose their beliefs and take away our healthcare and our rights, and I will continue to fight to ensure that healthcare is equal for all Americans.

Dr. Lawren, from my home state of Illinois, wrote to the Trump Administration in response to this rule.

She said, "As a physician, it is absolutely crucial that I provide the same level of care for every patient no matter how my own beliefs differ from theirs. I often have patients with whom I disagree about a wide spectrum of political and social causes. It would be so outrageously inappropriate for me to use that as grounds to change my medical care or to alter the level of respect and compassion I show for these patients."

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, we have heard a great deal today—actually, from both sides of the aisle pointing fingers across the way at the opposing party—about the issue of children:

taking care of children that are brought here illegally, taking care of children that supposedly come here on their own.

But since we know that nobody crosses from Mexico into the United States illegally without having the permission of the drug cartel that controls that section of the Mexico-U.S. border, it is not really accurate to say a child comes unaccompanied, because a child can't cross Mexico by himself. A child is brought by somebody.

Unfortunately, as we know, the figures from both government groups, Doctors Without Borders, and others are pretty staggering when you realize that such a large percentage—25 percent, 30 percent—of girls who come to the United States through Mexico are raped.

I have seen too many rape trees that it breaks my heart. It is just, as the poet said, incredible, the inhumanity to man. It is staggering.

And sometimes it is difficult to tell people no that want to come here, but there is not a country in the world that lets more people into that country than the United States does. There is nowhere.

Countries that are much bigger geographically, countries that have many more people, countries that have more space per person, there is no country that is as generous with the right being given to come in to a country legally as the United States, and I love that about our country.

But it is important to have rules about who gets to come in. Obviously, some have projected that there may be 1 billion, 1.5 billion people who would like to come to the United States. If the 300, 350 million or so people here were to have a billion people come in, obviously, this country would cease to exist as it has or is or could be. It would cease to exist. It would become a Third World country. There would be so much massive unemployment overwhelming the social services. Disease would become rampant.

As we see people coming here from other countries, there are diseases that we had completely eliminated in the United States that are now being reintroduced to the United States because we have not enforced our borders and made sure that people coming in, as welcome as they are to come in legally, that they are not coming in with a disease that puts people in the United States in jeopardy. Once you do that, then you don't continue to be that light on the hill that so many want to come to. There is no place left.

Last year, there were some people here who said: Well, you know, if we keep losing more and more of our freedom here in the United States, maybe we just can all go to Australia.

I had a few guys that I met with from Australia. I thought they would find that amusing. But they didn't smile; they didn't laugh. They said: Do you not understand? If you lose your freedom here in America, China will take

us over in a heartbeat. There will be no place you are going to be able to go.

The United States of America is the place that gives everyone else in the world hope for freedom.

□ 1315

I ran into the same thing in Nigeria, people imploring, in fact, some West Africans who were Christians wanted to meet with me before I left. The oldest gentleman said: You know, we wanted to make sure, before you went back to Washington, you understood we were all so thrilled when you elected your first Black President.

They said: But since President Obama has been the leader in the United States, we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And you have got to make sure people in Washington understand, when America gets weaker, we suffer.

Ebenezer was his name. He said: You know, we know where we are going when we die. We are Christians. We are believers. But our only chance of having some degree of safety in this life is if America is strong.

Unfortunately, as I heard from people there, as I have read since, the Obama administration was putting requirements: Look, we will give you more help in neutralizing Boko Haram, but you are going to have to legalize abortion, start paying for those, and you have got to legalize same-sex marriage, and then we will give you some serious help with Boko Haram.

In the meantime, the American administration had a hashtag, #bringbackourgirls. It didn't really do much. Actually, it didn't do anything, really. The hashtag went around and around, but thank God for people who stepped up like our government did not and actually helped girls, and some continue to be helped. I won't talk about where they are, how well they are doing.

But it is just really tragic when the United States Government that so many people around the world look to for hope, look to as an example of what perhaps their country could be someday, start losing hope when they see what happens here. It is tragic.

I know some say, and we have seen this over the years, whether it is Dr. Spock's book on how to raise children, don't ever say no. Gee, you might hurt their pride or enthusiasm. Don't ever punish, just encourage.

But the fact is that the reason we have laws that don't allow children to enter into binding contracts is because we understand that children can be too easily persuaded. That is why criminals are able to dangle candy or in some way entice children into situations wherein their lives are destroyed.

There is a time to say no out of love and caring.

I don't know anybody on either side of the aisle here, either party, who wants to see children harmed, but the fact is, as the border patrolmen tell me constantly both when I am down there

all night or when I am up here and hear from them: When you guys make it sound like anybody is welcome, especially if they have a child in their group, well, we have more children now coming, often to their own detriment, than we have ever had in our history.

So I understand the feeling, gee, let's don't say no to any child who wants to come into America accompanied, unaccompanied. We extend our arms.

But what happens? We know every time caravans, groups are coming in, big, small, people die trying to get in. The drug cartels are so corrupt, they will utilize children. They have no problem taking young girls and using them in sex trafficking.

And by our leaving that open, I hear it all the time from people who work the border: You guys lure them up here to their own harm. If you would just secure the border, these folks will quit coming, and you won't have thousands of girls being raped. You won't have people being sold into sex slavery.

And I say "sold," but it sounds more like, from the stories we get down there that what happens, and it is not on the list of questions a border patrolman asks as they are in-processing people, but sometimes it is asked: How much did you have to pay? And sometimes they will add: to the gang or the drug cartel to get you in here illegally?

The answer normally is 5, 6, 7, \$8,000. And again, the question is not on their list to ask, but sometimes they ask: How did you get that money? You don't have that kind of money. Where would you come up with that kind of money?

So often, the answer is: We got a thousand here. We had a thousand sent, \$1,500 sent from people in the United States, and they are going to let us work the rest off when we get where we are going.

So, so many are not sold into slavery. They just agree, without realizing, they are about to become an indentured servant to a drug cartel, and they are going to be a servant either in sex trafficking or drug trafficking.

So often I have stood there and watched people waiting to be processed, and they will have an address in a city in the U.S. And I have seen them, different times, exchange, and they would switch cities, and then they would tell the border patrolman: Here is the city where I have relatives, where I can go and be taken care of.

And it is where the drug cartels told them to go. So, technically, they are not sold into slavery, but they have agreed to be indentured servants to the drug cartels.

So it is amazing how many people seem shocked when they read story after story about how the drug cartels in Mexico have big operations in cities all over America. That is why the border patrolmen say: You know what the drug cartels call us? They call us their logistics.

Like the commercial?

Well, yeah. Like the commercial.

They get them across the border, and then the U.S. Government ships these people wherever the drug cartels want them to go.

Right now, they are so overwhelmed on our border, it is just tragic.

I know there are Christian groups that receive millions of dollars for going down and helping get people in and taking care of them. And it sure makes it appear like they are scared of losing the millions of dollars they get for assisting illegal aliens, but we need to be realistic.

When you are in a country that is self-governing, where you have an obligation as part of the government, if you are a citizen serving on juries, that makes you a judge of the facts of a case, or running for office, or voting, you vote because you are supposed to be the one who hires the servants who come to work in the county seat, the State capitol, the Federal Capitol.

But the people are supposed to be the real rulers, and those of us elected are supposed to be the servants. But there is an obligation that goes with the freedoms, and that obligation means you have got to enforce the law across the board.

Some people quote Scripture, saying, we have got to be good to the foreigners—true; we have got to help the widows and orphans—true; we ought to be encouraging and embracing of families—true.

But when you are acting as the government, you have a different role, and that is a role to ensure that the law is enforced evenly and fairly across the board without regard to someone's financial situation, social status, or anything else.

That is why there are verses in the Bible that say something to pray for is people who will not show favoritism to the rich and, also, verses say, not show favoritism to the poor. You treat everyone fairly across the board.

I sure got a lot of hateful things when I was a judge, and I revoked the probation of a daughter of one of the wealthy oil families in my hometown. They even had many of my supporters in the courtroom, thinking that would intimidate me from doing what I would have done to anyone else.

But as a judge, that is the job. You don't show favoritism to people because of their wealth or because of their lack of it. You enforce the laws fairly across the board.

Just as it would be crazy for a parent to welcome a child who can't swim to come jump in the pool, you say: No. No. That is dangerous. No, don't touch the hot stove. No, don't stick anything into the electric socket.

There is a time to say no. But some think that being loving and caring means never to say no. There is a time to say no.

If we enforce our borders and do so fairly and are fair about the over a million visas that we give out in this country—again, the most generous of any country in the world—just do so

fairly, then you don't have people forced into sex trafficking, forced into drug trafficking.

You know, the best, most compassionate thing we could say or do to help people in Mexico would be to totally secure the border so only people come in who are legally coming in and to shut down the money that the drug cartels are making off the drug trafficking and the sex trafficking because, according to some estimates, before they started getting so much money from human trafficking, they estimated \$80 billion, one source, \$80 billion or so from drug trafficking.

And what an incredible business model. They are making all this money off drugs, but they don't have to hire employees, because the employees come to them and pay them a fee to help them get to a place where they can sell the drugs for them at no charge to the drug cartels.

And don't think the drug cartels don't know how to say no and take lives. They know how to cut heads off and put them on pikes to intimidate people, to keep them in line.

There is nothing more difficult in Mexico than being a law enforcement officer who is dedicated to truly enforcing the law fairly, including against people in the drug cartels. Their lives are at great risk, as are their families'. But if we secure the border, build a wall where we need it, secure the border, then the money dries up to pay for corruption in Mexico.

Mexico, you think about Mexico. They ought to be a top ten economy. They have incredible natural resources. They have got a better location than North America. They are between North and South America. They are between the two oceans. They ought to be the greatest trader: all the natural resources, and, of course, they have got some of the hardest working people in the world.

Why are they not a top ten economy? Because of corruption.

How is corruption funded? From money coming across our border illegally for drugs that come in illegally or sex trafficking coming in.

What an incredible gift to the people of Mexico, so many of whom dream of a day when they could have an incredibly vibrant economy and they didn't have to worry about corrupt police or corrupt government officials.

That is why I know, when you hear some Mexican elected official say they don't want the border secured, then you can pretty well take it to the bank they are taking money to the bank from the drug cartels; otherwise, they would want to see Mexico reach its potential that cannot be reached as long as we are allowing tens of billions of dollars to flow from the United States to the drug cartels for the corruption of government and harm to people.

□ 1330

Now, there used to be an unwritten rule, as I understood it, that the drug

cartels would not kill anybody, rob, they would not let crime go on around Mexico's resorts. But that has certainly gone to the wayside.

My wife and I went on our honeymoon in Mexico. We celebrated our 25th anniversary in Mexico. But, as a government official, going to Mexico, with people and cartels knowing who I am, it is a dangerous place to go now, so we haven't been back in a long time. I look forward to the day when we can, and that day will be when we secure our border and Mexico achieves the status in the world's economies that it should because of what is there and the people. That would be a gift we should give them. But in the meantime, we make clear that we are securing our border, you are not coming in unless you come in through a port of entry, a legal port of entry, and you come in legally, you are not coming in.

Now we hear the stories, we read the stories and get the accounts, children are now a commodity. The drug cartels know that if somebody comes in with a child, with them or with their group, oh, gee, this is a big family. We saw all of the wild screaming and gnashing of teeth over children not being with parents. So they know they are not going to be separated and they are going to be able to stay in the country. So they are coming. They are coming in greater numbers than ever before.

If you look back at some of the numbers from the nineties, it was 80 percent, as I recall. And somebody was just referring to the numbers recently, about 80 percent were single adults from Mexico, men, who were coming for jobs. And now, because of the dramatization over what happens every day, in every county in the country, and that is an adult who has committed a crime or is arrested for committing a crime, being separated from a child. It happens every day.

I used to sign warrants to arrest people, and they certainly didn't bring the children to the jail with them. They were separated from their children. It is what happens when a government is trying to be fair and not make the children suffer or be punished for the sins of the parent. That is what a caring society would do. You don't punish the children for the wrongs of the parent. But now, children are a commodity. They are being rented, purchased, and used in order to better ensure that people coming in illegally will be able to stay here.

I did vote against my own party's motion to recommit. That is not the way that kind of spending should be done. Two billion dollars will end up luring people again to this country. If we advertise, and people will know, the drug cartels will use it. Look, they just voted through a provision that will provide \$2 to \$3 billion for medicine, medication, for people who come into the country illegally. That is not something we should be playing a game with. That is why I voted no. This is too serious to be taken lightly.

We shouldn't be playing politics with things like that. Let's secure the border and take care of folks who are here and ensure that people who come into this country do so legally.

Actually, I asked a question to Secretary Nielsen when she was at Homeland Security this year. I asked her: What if we were to have immigration judges, not in an interior courtroom somewhere across America, but had immigration judges there at the border, even if we had to just set up big tents, have the immigration judges at the border? She said that would solve the problem. You wouldn't have to give somebody a notice to come back for a hearing 4 years from now to determine whether they can stay in the country legally or not, and for which most people never come back for their hearing.

I am hopeful that, at some point, President Trump will say: Do you know what, let's don't set hearings years off. In fact, Secretary Nielsen, as I recall, indicated, if somebody is kept there at a facility near the border, they normally have a hearing 90 to 100 days, 120 days, from when they are picked up. But if they are released on some kind of recognizance or bond, it is years, on average, before they have their hearing. Well, let's solve that.

Let's just send our immigration judges to the border. If you come across and claim asylum, let's have your hearing today, and we will know by tonight whether you get to stay or whether we are taking you back across.

But it doesn't do much good to "deport" someone who is here illegally if you don't secure the border. That is why a guy who ended up in my felony courtroom, who had nine DWIs and didn't speak English, and he finally came to my felony court after—normally, a third DWI gets charged as a felony, but somehow, he had gotten by. And on the ninth DWI—he was driving while intoxicated—he ended up causing an accident, nearly killed some folks, and did serious damage.

But I figured if he had nine DWIs, this guy is a threat to the safety of everybody in this country. Everybody legally and illegally in this country is at risk if this guy is here, out, and driving.

So I went ahead and sent him to prison. Nine DWIs is far too many, especially when you start doing serious bodily injury to people. And I was shocked that within 6 months he was back in my courtroom. He was driving drunk and hurt somebody else.

Through the interpreter, I asked him: How is he back here in my courtroom? I sent him to prison. And he said: Well, about 3 months after—well, at that time, it was not even 3 months, it may have been a month—he was picked up and deported. They carried him to the border. And through the interpreter, he explained that they made him walk across the border. And I said: So how are you back here? He said: I waited until the deportation officers drove off. And then he came back across the border as soon as they left, got back to

drinking and driving, and ended up back in my courtroom.

So, this time, I thought, well, if he is going to be here, obviously, he is an alcoholic, so I sent him to a substance abuse felony punishment facility because everybody there is either an alcoholic or a drug addict. They go through a 12-step program. And I figured, well, if he is going to be in the country, for heaven's sake, he at least needs to be clean and sober. And I got word that at that facility he was there about 90 days before he was deported. I would imagine he came back in the country somewhere, but, obviously, not back to my county.

So why wouldn't we enforce our borders? A country that has no borders, or that has borders that are not enforced, it is not a country, it is not definable, it is just kind of an area where people go.

If we are going to continue to be a shining light for so many countries and so many people around the world, we need to follow the law, not show favoritism, not to people because they are poor, not to people because they are rich, but to be fair and enforce the laws across the board.

That brings me to an important point that has been in the news a great deal lately, and, actually, it has been going on for some time. This country, regardless of how many people may want to rewrite history, was largely inhabited and founded by people who were Christians, different denominations, who were looking to have a place where they were not persecuted for being a Christian. And I know, we are told, as Christians, we are going to suffer for Christ's sake. And I know Jesus said, remember, when they hate you, they hated me first.

But, for whatever reason, we have been allowed to have a country, unlike most any place in history, where you are not persecuted for being a Christian. Now, there are different denominations that would have big controversies with other denominations. Some of that was playing out in the first 5 weeks of the constitutional convention in 1787.

That is when Ben Franklin gave his famous speech. How do we know what he said? Well, Madison was taking notes. But afterwards, Franklin was asked for a copy of his speech. He sat down and wrote it out. Everybody who was there who saw the speech said: Oh, yeah, this is word for word everything he said.

And I know most children apparently in the country are taught that Ben Franklin was a deist, you know, someone who believed that there was some force, some being, something that created the universe. And if that thing, being, force still exists anymore, it never interferes with the laws of nature or the activity of human beings, it never gets involved. And kids are being taught Ben Franklin was a deist.

But he stood up. He is 82 years old. He has gout, he has advanced arthritis,

he is overweight, he has trouble getting up and down the few steps into Independence Hall, he has trouble getting up, he has a cane, and often had to have help.

And he hadn't really spoken to that point at the convention. One of the people at the convention wrote that President Washington—he wasn't President of the country, he was President of the constitutional convention—that President Washington looked relieved when Dr. Franklin sought recognition because there was so much screaming going on. Franklin didn't have an M.D. or a Ph.D., but he was certainly recognized as being worthy of being a doctor.

But Franklin gets up—he probably had help—and we know what he said because he wrote it down. And he starts about saying, you know, we have been going on for nearly 5 weeks. We have got more noes than ayes on virtually every vote. And then this is his verbatim, he says:

How has it happened, sir, that we have not thought of humbly seeking illumination from the source of all life?

That is not verbatim, but close.

He said:

In the beginning of the contest with Great Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayer in this room. Our prayers so were heard, and they were graciously answered.

Then he goes on to point out that everybody in there should remember specific things that they prayed for as leaders in the Continental Congress during the Revolution, and that they should remember how specific things they prayed for were answered by God.

And then back to verbatim he says: "I have lived, sir, a long time." He is a year or so away from meeting his maker. And he said: "And the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without his notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without his aid?"

□ 1345

He is talking about the Bible: We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that no empire is going to rise without his aid.

He says that we have a chance to create something special. These are not his verbatim words. He said if we take advantage of that and we come together, by the grace of God, we are going to have a special country. He adds, without God's grace, we are going to succeed no better than the builders of Babel.

He said that we will be confounded by our local partial interests, and we, ourselves, shall become a byword down through the ages.

He goes on and ends up making a motion, just like during the Revolution, just like with the Continental Congress, that the Constitutional Convention should start with prayer every day.

See, it was really a secular Congress because they voted that down. If you go look at what the discussion was, there were a bunch of different denominations there. Usually, the Quakers were most disagreeable about whom they would approve for saying a prayer for the whole group.

As the debate pointed out, yes, during the Revolution, we had a treasury. We had money so we could hire a Christian chaplain to say the prayer every day for us.

There wasn't anybody here that could say a prayer that everybody else in the Convention would feel got a fair shake for their denomination. But we could hire, agree on, one chaplain, one minister who would say a prayer for everybody.

Here we are at the Convention, and we are not getting paid. We don't have a treasury, so we are going to have to put off hiring a chaplain to do the prayer every day until we get this constitution done. That is why it didn't get approved.

Then Randolph from Virginia gets up. He says he understands that we don't have money to hire a chaplain to do the prayer every day, but here we are at the end of June—this is 1787. He said it is the end of June, and we are about to celebrate our Nation's birthday. We are not accomplishing anything, so why don't we recess here now and reconvene together in a church that we all agree on, a Christian church. We all go there together, and on our Nation's birthday, we worship God together. Then we come back and try to work this constitution thing out.

That passed. The Delegates at the Constitutional Convention came together and worshipped on our Nation's birthday at the Reformed Calvinist Church in Philadelphia, Reverend William Rogers presiding. He was the minister. I think you can even find online one of the prayers that he prayed for the Convention.

As somebody wrote back then, when they came back together, there were differences. There was a different spirit, and they were able to come together. They were able to reach an agreement.

There was such strong division among the most populous States. They said we are the most populous States, so we ought to have more representation. Others said, no, we can't come together unless we all have equal representation.

The Great Compromise came together, that we will have two separate bodies within the Congress. We will have one where States have representation based on the population, and it won't be like the House of Lords where they really don't have any power. This will be a separate body. They will have just as much power as the other house, but every State gets two representatives, and then we will balance.

That was the Great Compromise. It enabled them to come together. There

were great concerns about human rights and government intrusion into people's private matters. They wanted to make sure that a king or President couldn't just sign an order to go search somebody's home, take over a home, or go gather up anything they wanted.

They agreed that if we come together on this Constitution, then we also agree that it must have a Bill of Rights that comes with it.

The first of the Bill of Rights that was approved, the first 10 amendments, they didn't want to have a Church of England that was the official government church. They didn't want a government church.

Of course, now we got one. It is called, informally, the church of secularism the Supreme Court has forced us into. Regardless of what anybody thinks, a government—and I used to say in college that you can't legislate morality. Eventually, I have realized a government legislates somebody's morality. It may be no morality, and we have kind of come to that.

Moses' face is up there because at one time he was considered to be the greatest lawgiver of all time. You have Hammurabi, the Justinian Code, started by Justin. Napoleon, Jefferson—Jefferson didn't help with the Constitution, but these are all the great lawgivers, considered as such. We have two or three Popes up here. But Moses was supposed to be the great one.

In recent years, children are being taught there is no real right or wrong. It is whatever you feel in your heart is wrong, and it is all relative. Right and wrong are relative. That is not what Moses said.

I was hearing Dennis Prager earlier today saying you cannot have a free country based on secularist beliefs, based on atheism. You can't.

The only way you can have the level of freedom we have had is not requiring everybody to be a Christian but to base the government upon Judeo-Christian beliefs. That has been our history.

We welcome people. We don't mind anybody having any religion or no religion. But the only way you can have that kind of freedom is to base it on Christian beliefs.

I know from visiting with General Jay Garner, who President Bush initially sent to Iraq to talk to people and get a feel from the Iraqis what kind of government they should have, he talked to a direct descendant of Mohammed.

There were a lot of people with him. After they left, General Garner asked if everybody heard what they said.

They all agreed they heard. There was a reporter there. They asked if he was going to write that in a story. He said, no, nobody will believe it. They would think he was crazy.

But this very devout Muslim, descendant of Mohammed, said, in essence—summary—we need a government that is based on a constitution that Iraqis write, that the government be composed of Iraqis, and the con-

stitution needs to be based on the teachings of Jesus.

After he left, General Garner asked: Did you guys all hear that?

He said, yes, he said they need a constitution based on the teachings of Jesus. A devout Muslim descendant of Mohammed agreed that if you really want a free society, use the teachings of Jesus.

The Founders knew, just like the descendant of Mohammed, that is the best way to have a free country. But now we are seeing more and more the persecution of Christians.

Now the U.N. General Secretary, back when he was in charge of all the refugee programs, was asked about why there is not as high a percentage of Christians in the U.N. refugee program as there is a percentage of Christians in the areas where refugees are coming from, like Syria.

He basically made the statement that Christians are so very important to those geographic areas that we think it is important to leave them where they are. They were being wiped out where they were.

The truth is, when Christians were coming to the U.N. refugee camps to be reassigned or sent elsewhere after that, they were often victims of violence.

I read many reports, talked to people over in some of the refugee camps. The Christians didn't want to go there. They didn't like the way they were picked on, so you didn't find that many Christians in those camps.

Here is an article from May 3. This is from the BBC because this stuff is not being reported properly in the mainstream media in America.

The title is, "Christians Are 'Most Persecuted Group.'" It says, "The persecution of Christians in parts of the world is at or near 'genocide' levels, according to a report ordered by the Foreign Secretary Jeremy Hunt." That is the Foreign Secretary in England.

Christians were the most persecuted religious group, is what this study found.

"The interim report said the main impact of 'genocidal acts against Christians is exodus' and that Christianity faced being 'wiped out' from parts of the Middle East. It warned the religion"—talking about Christianity—"is at risk of disappearing' in some parts of the world, pointing to figures which claimed Christians in Palestine represent less than 1.5 percent of the population, while in Iraq they had fallen from 1.5 million before 2003 to less than 120,000."

"Evidence shows not only the geographic spread of anti-Christian persecution, but also its increasing severity."

It says, "In some regions, the level and nature of persecution is arguably coming close to meeting the international definition of genocide, according to that adopted by the U.N.' . . . Its findings come after more than 250 people were killed and more than 500 wounded in attacks at hotels and

churches in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday."

I mean, this is the kind of stuff going on.

The article goes on, again from the BBC, "What we have forgotten in that atmosphere of political correctness is actually the Christians that are being persecuted are some of the poorest people on the planet."

"In response to the report, the president of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Marie van der Zyl, said Jews had often been the targets of persecution and felt for Christians who were discriminated against on the basis of their faith.

"Whether it is authoritarian regimes or bigotry masked in the mistaken guise of religion, reports like the one launched today remind us that there are many places in which Christians face appalling levels of violence, abuse, and harassment."

Pretty tragic. Then here in the United States, this story from CBN News, May 7, this year, the Pacific Institute, "The Pacific Justice Institute, PJI, announced Tuesday that a Bible study for elderly residents of the Veterans Home of California has been restored."

□ 1400

"The facility is owned and operated by the California Department of Veterans Affairs.

"The nonprofit PJI," Pacific Justice Institute, "also says its attorneys will continue to fight for full restoration of religious freedom in the facility.

"After some negotiation, CalVet"—that is California Department of Veterans Affairs—"said it would allow Artis Breaux and her Bible study attendees to resume the Bible study, effective immediately, after it had been shut down for weeks.

"However, CalVet"—that is California Department of Veterans Affairs—"continues to insist that it can investigate and substantiate allegations against Breaux and her fellow residents for expressing religious views that it"—the California Department of Veterans Affairs—"deems 'offensive,' and even for discussing Heaven and salvation.

"We are encouraged that CalVet realized it could no longer prohibit and threaten the veterans' Bible study," PJI President Brad Dacus said in a press release. At the same time, the agency's position that it can continue to punish religious"—and really, Christian expression is specifically what CalVet is going after—"expression it deems discourteous or offenses is unacceptable. We've won an important first round in this battle for these heroes"—the veterans—"and we are committed to seeing this through to complete victory.

"PJI attorneys began representing Breaux last fall when staff at the veterans home complained that she had committed 'emotional abuse' and 'elder abuse' by allegedly causing another

resident to lose sleep after a discussion about Heaven and hell. Last week, CalVet admitted the allegation was unsubstantiated. . . .”

“This past March, a CalVet attorney threatened to have Breau removed from the home if she did not immediately halt her longtime Bible study.

“What we’ve seen at the Veterans Home of California should concern every freedom-loving American’ . . . ‘Of all people, our veterans and their widows from the Greatest Generation should enjoy the greatest blessings of liberty—not the least. We’re not about to let up until these veterans have complete freedom.’”

That is from the PJI attorneys. It is just outrageous how wrongheaded people have gotten, and that is because they are imposing a court-ordered imposition of secularism.

We have come to a point in political correctness where the only group that is politically correct to abuse, belittle, and discriminate against is Christians. You don’t have to like Christians, but for heaven’s sake, that is the kind of freedom in allowing Christians to worship freely that made us the greatest country in history.

Now we have got the Equality Act. Supposedly, it is going to come up next week.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 was passed by a huge majority of Democrats in 1993 because they were concerned, in 1993, some of them, including our current chairman of the Judiciary Committee, JERRY NADLER, about the persecution of Christians and Jews, and they saw the need to have the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993.

Back then, these same people believed that Moses knew what he was talking about, and when Jesus quoted Moses verbatim about marriage, that he knew what he was talking about.

In fact, we knew that that still was true in 2008, from David Axelrod’s book. They knew that Barack Obama could not win the Presidency if he said of marriage with the same sex, that that was fine. It was not sufficient to say—you could have same-sex relationships. That was fine. But marriage is what the Bible said is between a man and a woman.

Apparently, they had polled it every which way, and in 2008, if you thought marriage was something besides what Moses believed and that Jesus said as he quoted Moses verbatim, then you couldn’t get elected President.

Now, if you say: I still think what Moses and Jesus said is what marriage ought to be. Same-sex relations are one thing, but marriage, historically, except perhaps during the days of Moses—my understanding is even in Sodom and Gomorrah, obviously, same-sex relationships were fine, but even there, marriage was for procreation; therefore, it was a man and a woman. Now if you say that, you are to be persecuted. You are to be destroyed for believing Moses and Jesus knew what they were talking about.

But some of those same people who rammed through the Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 have now added this provision that that Religious Freedom Restoration Act of 1993 shall not provide a claim or a defense to a claim under this bill, and there is even a provision here that you can have a claim filed against a bank, a lending institution, if they don’t lend money to someone who is gender confused.

That is what gender dysphoria is. That is what the DSM-5 calls it, gender dysphoria, like the opposite of euphoria. It is confusion about one’s gender, biological gender, which may disagree with what they feel like that day.

We are seeing great gains made by women in women’s sports. If this becomes law, that will be destroyed. You will have men’s sports, and you will have coed sports.

As the lady who was the first to ever benefit by having a women’s scholarship from Villanova said—she is a Ph.D.—when she testified: Look, you have got thousands of men who can beat the best time in the world for the women’s 400 meter in the 2016 Olympics. Women won’t be the ones getting the scholarships anymore if this Equality Act becomes law.

Martina Navratilova, she makes no bones about being a lesbian, and she has been basically destroyed in social media for saying that a woman should not have to compete with a biological man. It is unfair.

We had a lady who tells us, she was a lesbian testifying: Look, women’s sports are going to be destroyed if you pass this bill. All the great gains made for women being treated fairly and equally are going to go by the wayside.

I know from my days as a judge, hearing the tragic stories of sexual assault and aggravated sexual assault, that women suffer from a greater percentage of post-traumatic stress disorder than soldiers do if they have been sexually assaulted.

One of the things that can trigger the trauma again is being in a confined space and a man comes in. But the response from the majority is, well, they just basically need to get over it because we don’t want to hurt the man’s feelings if he thinks he is a woman.

I hope this doesn’t pass. I hope it doesn’t become law. There are some great things in here for equality, but that is not one of them.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of his daughter’s college graduation.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 14, 2019, at noon 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:

974. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting a report describing the potential impacts on national defense and the manufacturing base resulting from contractors or subcontractors relocating steam turbine production for Nimitz-class and Ford-class aircraft carriers and Virginia-class and Columbia-class submarines, pursuant to Public Law 115-232, Sec. 338; (132 Stat. 1728); to the Committee on Armed Services.

975. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Industrial Policy, Acquisition and Sustainment, Department of Defense, transmitting an interim response to a small business strategy requirement, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2283 note; Public Law 115-232, Sec. 851(b)(2)(A); (132 Stat.1884); to the Committee on Armed Services.

976. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation’s final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received May 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

977. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Cyflumetofen; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2017-0532; FRL-9990-60] received May 6, 2019, 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.

978. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Pesticides; Technical Amendment to Data Requirements for Antimicrobial Pesticides [EPA-HQ-OPP-2018-0668; FRL-9984-52] (RIN: 2070-AK41) received May 6, 2019, 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.

979. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Beckman Instruments Superfund Site [EPA-HQ-SFUND-1986-0005; FRL-9993-34-Region 9] received May 6, 2019, 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.

980. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Environmental Protection Agency Acquisition Regulation (EPAAR) Clause Update for Submission of Invoices [EPA-HQ-OARM-2018-0742; FRL 9992-99-OMS] received May 6, 2019, 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.

981. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency’s final rule — Approval and Promulgation of