

dedication to addressing maternal health in the fiscal year 2020 Labor-HHS appropriations bill, including through the following investments: \$1.58 billion for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which supports research that investigates the causes and interventions for maternal health disparities among Black women; \$50 million to initiate research on maternal mortality and disparities in maternal mortality rates; and a \$12 million increase in funding for the CDC Safe Motherhood and Infant Health program's Maternal Mortality Review Committees, supporting research to comprehensively assess maternal deaths and identify opportunities for prevention.

This funding is an important step forward toward achieving optimal birth outcomes for all families.

Madam Speaker, I thank the Appropriations Committee, and hope my colleagues will continue to support funding for programs that will improve the outcomes for women and families.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDAL

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

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, central Virginia is home to some of the most community-centered and service-minded students in the country, and yesterday I was fortunate to recognize two of these students as winners of the Congressional Award Gold Medal.

Two of my constituents, Kasey Mize from Jeffersonson and Ciara Noelle Smith from Chesterfield, earned this national recognition for their respective work in community service, personal development, physical fitness, and exploration of the world around them.

Kasey's community service centered on organizing a sewing circle and providing more than 200 dresses a year to impoverished girls around the world, breaking down practical barriers that keep many girls from attending schools.

Ciara's service to her community involved volunteer hours spent working at the Science Museum of Virginia and constructing rehabilitation structures for a central Virginia wildlife foundation.

Both young people have demonstrated an ability to set goals, make a strategy, and see it through to the end.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Kasey and Ciara on their accomplishments. I look forward to seeing how these two amazing young women will continue contributing to our Seventh District communities in the future.

HONORING ALVIN JONES

(Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Alvin Francis Jones, a lifelong New Mexican judge, lawyer, and community leader.

Born in New Mexico in 1944, Alvin earned a bachelor's degree from New Mexico Tech and a juris doctor from the University of New Mexico.

He began his career in private practice and was later appointed to New Mexico's Fifth Judicial District in Roswell, where he served for 19 years, many as chief judge.

During his time on the bench, he founded the local chapters of CASA to help vulnerable children navigate the State legal system, and Character Counts, teaching children the value of good character.

After retiring from the bench in 2004, Alvin joined a private practice, where he specialized in water law.

For me, he was a personal example of character. He had a dogged work ethic, and he also dedicated time and resources to mentor New Mexicans.

A pillar of the community who was loved by his family and friends alike, Alvin leaves behind a legacy of selfless service to New Mexico.

We are grateful and will miss him dearly.

MEDICAID CLIFF

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

Mr. SABLAN. Madam Speaker, the Mariana Islands and four other U.S. insular areas face a Medicaid "cliff".

Funding included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act expires this year.

Two-thirds of our annual Medicaid funding disappears, gone, putting healthcare at risk not just for Medicaid recipients, but for everyone who uses our hospital or other providers, because they depend as well on Medicaid revenues to stay in business or open.

I held a hearing last month on this Medicaid cliff. Chair ESHOO held a hearing yesterday, for which I am grateful.

This attention is good. We need Congress to focus on this impending healthcare crisis for Americans living in the insular areas.

Certainly, more money is needed. Treat the insular areas like the States. But the goal is not just money.

What we want is medical care for those who need it in the insular areas to be every bit as good as medical care anywhere in America.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-44)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, and Executive Order 13810 of September 20, 2017, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2019.

The existence and risk of proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil United States Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466 with respect to North Korea.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 21, 2019.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I have comments about my giving remarks at the end of the week, so it might be worth setting a little history of these Special Order remarks.

In 2005 and 2006, my first term, I was not prone to give any remarks in Special Orders, but I observed during those 2 years that one of my classmates that came in January 2005, like I did, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and some other Democrats arranged each night, often taking both hours of Special Orders that their party was afforded.

I was told by Republicans who had been here for a long time, "You know,

nobody is paying any attention to what they are saying. They are making themselves look bad. They make us look good by what they say.”

There were times I would say, “But are you paying attention to what they are saying?”

You could see on C-SPAN sometimes when the sound was off, it would be scrolling, and I would say, “Look what they are saying. They are blaming us for all kinds of things. We need to respond. This isn’t accurate.”

And I was told, “Look, you know, don’t worry about it. It doesn’t make any difference.”

And over the course of 2 years, I saw that a group that called themselves the 30 Somethings—everyone that was probably in their sixties or seventies, but otherwise in their thirties—that they did affect national opinion. I mean, you could see over that many nights, they made a difference.

After that, I endeavored to try to address some of the critical issues when I had the chance, if other Members of my party were not taking those opportunities.

So on fly-out days, when so many are rushing and have to get to the airport by a certain time, they don’t have time to come down here and address some of our critical issues, then I volunteer. I will stay an extra hour or two before catching a plane back to Texas in order to address some of these important things. And it is a great opportunity.

I used to do more than one Special Order a week many times, but my Democrat friend, and I mean that sincerely, JOHN GARAMENDI, had referred to a new Democrat rule that was put in place this year that no one could take more than one Special Order during the week, my friend, JOHN, referred to that as the Louie Gohmert rule.

The good thing about that was that it enabled me not to just continue as I had been year after year encouraging other Republicans to take a Special Order and address some of these important national issues, then I was able this year to tell them, “Look, I can only do one a week, so you guys have got to start signing up for Special Orders and taking the time, addressing areas that you know well that we need to communicate about.”

So I have been very pleased with how many of my colleagues have signed up for Special Orders and addressed critical issues, helped educate on the matters before us, because you don’t always get straight and accurate news even by some of the so-called fact-checkers.

Often fact-checkers, as they call themselves, need fact-checking, because many times they are not accurate either.

□ 1215

So this is a great opportunity that we have in a legislative body to address issues so that information does get out to the public, unless they are reading the remarks in some article that has

had the facts and statements twisted and edited to change the meaning. Otherwise, they can judge for themselves exactly what has been said and what is accurate and what isn’t.

I heard our Majority Leader HOYER and our Minority Whip SCALISE and their dialogue back and forth bringing up the critical issue of our border and the humanitarian crisis going on there. In their discussion, they did not get into what is causing—well, I guess they referred to it. People are trying to get away from terrible circumstances.

Well, those circumstances in different places in the world have gone on for centuries. We have never had the kind of mass effort at entrance that we have seen in recent months.

So, things haven’t gotten worse in the world. Why the huge surge at our border this year? And the border patrolmen with whom I communicate, the people who are dealing with those coming in illegally, coming through places that are not legal ports of entry, the border patrolmen get information from immigrants exactly why they are coming.

Sometimes immigrants are given pieces of paper—the immigrants coming in illegally—with addresses, names, and these are either approved or given by the drug cartels. Nobody comes into the United States across our southern border without permission of the drug cartels.

The drug cartels are not interested in preventing humanitarian crises. Drug cartels are interested in helping create humanitarian crises. And since I have been there all hours of the night, which used to be the prime time for people coming across illegally—now they are just coming all the time—I got to see this so many times firsthand.

I have even seen, numerous times, people that had their little piece of paper. It was supposed to be the address that they gave the Border Patrol and, later, ICE: Yes, this is the address where I have somebody waiting for me, somebody who knows me, a family member.

Often that information was provided by the drug cartels: This is where you will go.

This actually fit together to help answer mysteries of who is telling them where to go.

But the immigrants would be asked by Border Patrol, and it wasn’t on the list of questions they are required to ask: How much did you pay the gang or the drug cartels that are responsible for bringing you in? Because sometimes the drug cartels have gang members who will act as coyotes and bring people in illegally. And the answer is, normally, \$6,000, \$7,000, \$8,000.

And the question follow-up: Where did you get that kind of money? You don’t have that kind of money.

Well, we have got \$1,000 or \$1,500 here, and then people in the U.S. send us some money.

Well, what about the rest of it?

And the disturbing comment was, normally: They are going to let me

work that off when I get where I am going.

Well, these are drug cartels, and obviously the work they were going to be doing would be either drug trafficking or sex trafficking, both doing severe damage to our country. Yet we have not been able to reach passage of a bill, bipartisan or otherwise, that would actually help totally secure our border so we can control who comes in and ensure that they are not people who are wanting to do damage to the country.

Now, some just want to come in the country, and they don’t realize, by coming in, they will do damage, that they have not been educated on how you keep, how you retain a representative form of government and how with the liberties and freedoms come great responsibilities.

The responsibilities portion has also been neglected in so many schools. It is all about rights without getting into responsibilities.

But I will continue to bring up Ben Franklin’s answer to the woman after the Constitutional Convention: Sir, what have you given us?

A republic, madam, if you can keep it.

Eric Metaxas has a book on this that I read recently. It is very difficult to keep a self-governing system going. Historically, any attempt at some type of self-government has not lasted normally more than 200 years. We are beyond that.

The Constitution was ratified and first elected a Congress, President, and Vice President under the Constitution of 1787 that finished being ratified in 1789. So we are 230 years beyond that founding document being ratified. So we are beyond the number of years that a self-government has been able to last in the past, normally.

The fact is there haven’t been normal self-governments, and that is why, in Ben Franklin’s speech at the Constitutional Convention, although kids are taught today in school that he was a deist, if Franklin is even mentioned at all—a deist believing there is maybe some force, some thing, some whatever out there that created things, and if such force or person or being or deity existed and still exists, it never interferes with nature or the things that were set in motion originally. That is, in essence, a shorthand rendition of a deist.

But Franklin himself, we know what he said, because he wrote it down when people asked for a copy. He said: I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth. God governs in the affairs of man.

This means he wasn’t a deist.

But he says: If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it possible an empire could rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writing, that unless the Lord builds this House, they labor in vain to build it.

He said: I firmly believe this. I also firmly believe without His concurring

aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel. We will be confounded by our partial local interests, and we, ourselves, shall become a bower down through the ages.

Because Franklin knew. He studied history along with science and other things, but he knew from history this is not something that had been effectively done the way they were wanting to do it.

Sure, the Romans had had a Senate. The Greeks had made an effort at democracy that worked for a short time—not well, but worked for a short time.

The British, from whom we separated, they had a Parliament, but they also had a king. This was going to be a new thing. And the “*Novus ordo seclorum*” that is under the pyramid on the two-sided Great Seal that was adopted over 200 years ago, “*Novus ordo seclorum*,” Latin, meaning, “new order of things,” “new order of the ages.”

Some have tried to say: A-ha, new world order.

But if you look at the Founders’ own remarks, they make it clear that they knew nobody had really gotten this self-government thing right. But if they could do it right—and as Franklin said, it wasn’t going to happen right without the Lord’s concurring aid.

But if they could get it right, this would be a new order of things. This would be what people around the world, for the rest of history, would probably try to emulate, if not outright imitate.

But if they didn’t get it right, since they had the opportunity and failed, as Franklin said, they would become a bower down through the ages. They would be ridiculed. They had the chance to do self-government right, and they blew it.

But even though they got this thing incredibly right, the founding document and the agreed upon 10 Amendments, the Bill of Rights, obviously it has taken a couple hundred years to get the Constitution to apply and mean what it says. It took a Civil War. It took a civil rights movement. But here we are today, and we have not continued to educate people on what Franklin knew would require education in order to keep the Republic.

Oh, sure, we have got more schools now than ever, but because of the heavy-handedness of the Federal Government Department of Education, even though that education is something that is not an enumerated power in the Constitution and, therefore, under the Tenth Amendment was reserved for rights only of the States and the local government, the Federal Government got involved and, as a result, not many students are being taught the complete history that they should know and they need to know in order to sustain this little experiment in self-government.

So when people come in and they have not been educated at all on what

it takes to keep a self-governing system, they are just told in their own language about all of the free things they can get, they are not told about the important responsibilities that come with those free things and opportunities, that keeps up for so long, and there is no bright light on a hill that draws people from around the world.

Then, as some West Africans told me, when America gets weak, we suffer. And we are seeing that around the world.

Iranians are suffering tremendously under a heavy-handed, even criminal, terrorist regime in Iran that came into place because we had a President who didn’t understand radical Islam, did not understand that when he turned his back on the Shah, who was not a great guy—he apparently did not treat his people as well as they should have been—nonetheless, things certainly got worse.

When the Ayatollah was welcomed into power by President Carter as a man of peace, well, the world soon found that Iran, now that radical Islamists who wanted a new caliphate for the world to subjugate Christians and every other religious group under their mean-spirited, actually, dictatorship as a religious dictatorship, the people of Iran suffered. The world has suffered from the failure during the Carter administration to understand the dangers that were lurking there. Well, those dangers are no longer lurking there. They are being spread around the world.

I was amazed to hear people on television say, well, they couldn’t really say if Iran had caused the death of any Americans. Certainly they have.

Not long after the Ayatollah Khomeini took over in Iran, our Embassy was attacked and over 50 individuals were taken hostage. But they have continued to support terrorism, unabated, over all these years since 1979.

□ 1230

They are responsible for the deaths and the explosions at the Marine barracks in Beirut in 1983. And the message that was sent by the Democratic majority in the House and Senate was to force the complete withdrawal of troops in the area.

So that was a great encouragement to the Ayatollah and to the radical Islamists that want to destroy self-government. They think that they need a dictator who is really a religious bigot in control of things to dictate to people what they can or can’t do, and that is such a foreign concept after 230 years here under our Constitution.

But anybody who studies history, who is up on his history, knows there is a lot better chance that a dictatorship will eventually prevail, whether it is a religious extremist like you have ruling in Iran or it is just a dictator like you have had in the Soviet Union.

So having been in the Soviet Union for a summer as an exchange student between my sophomore and junior year

of college, I saw the way people suffered. I saw the way the government spied on its people; I saw the mean-spirited things the government did to people that weren’t being manipulated the way they wanted them to be; I saw suppression of free thought and free exchange of ideas; and I came home literally thanking God that we didn’t have that kind of suppressive government.

But in the intervening years, we have seen a government get so powerful that it can spy on its own people, and we saw with what was released by WikiLeaks, the FISA application, the underlying affidavit, and the order that—holy cow, the FISA judge just basically ignored the Fourth Amendment, the protections against unwarranted searches and seizures.

The application, my interpretation, was basically it said: We just need all of the information Verizon has on every customer they have and an underlying affidavit saying, basically, yeah, we just need every bit of information Verizon has on every customer.

And then the judge—even though a Federal, Senate-confirmed judge, it is a secret court—he just signs off on it: Oh, you want every bit of information Verizon has on every single customer? Sure, yeah. Why don’t you provide that? Here, here is an order to provide it.

That scared me because it actually confirmed what some of us had feared back when the Patriot Act was being reauthorized in my first term: Wait a minute. This is giving the Federal Government power that could go too far. There is language that is too loosely written that could allow the government to spy on people without proper authority.

We have got to revisit those issues.

And that has been further brought to a head with what we are learning about the abuses of the FISA court when one administration wanted to spy on a campaign and then spy on—and, hopefully, eliminate—the selection of a majority of the electoral college.

The electoral college itself underwent some evolution back in the early days, because, originally, it was a brilliant idea. It was a way of ensuring that both heavily populated States and lesser-populated States would all be relevant in a national election for our President and Vice President.

Unfortunately, in the beginning, the second highest vote getter became the Vice President, and that became apparent as a failure and a bad idea under the Presidency of John Adams, when Jefferson, his dear friend, became Vice President with the second highest number of votes. By the end of the fourth year, as McCullough points out in his book on John Adams, Jefferson even hired a notorious newspaperman to make up some lies about Adams to help him defeat him, which he did, which probably explains why Adams is the only President who didn’t stick

around for the inauguration of his successor. But that got changed to a constitutional amendment, and so we have the electoral process.

If you do away with the electoral college, then it would mean most every State that is not a heavily populated State will never see a candidate running for President, because it would be a waste. They will want to spend their time in the heavy population centers and mainly disregard what some people refer to as flyover States, which many of us feel are the real guts and the heart of the country.

So it is an important thing to have, but people are not getting education on these things these days, and why things were created the way in which they were, what succeeded, what failed.

When I do tours around the Capitol, sometimes they go a lot longer than I think they should, but I am ready to stop any time the people are, but they still have questions. We find so many people haven't gotten the education.

I hear so often: I never really liked history in school.

Well, that doesn't tell me anything about them. It tells me a lot about their history teachers, that they had history teachers who didn't understand the importance of history, so they had true/false, multiple choice, or fill-in-the-blank questions rather than emphasizing that the real importance in history is the stories, what went right, what went wrong.

Yes, it helps to have them in chronological order, but the more important aspect is what worked and what didn't. And that is not what so many American students are getting anymore.

And certainly those who are rushing into America illegally, they certainly haven't gotten that. They know America is supposed to be a better place, but they don't know why. They don't know that they are jeopardizing that country's ability to continue as an attractive place for people to want to go, the most attractive place for immigrants to want to come in the entire world.

So we have got more education to do. And I am hoping that our colleagues here in this body will begin to understand that, when we take up legislation that will ultimately legalize illegal activity—like coming into the country illegally or giving benefits for coming in illegally—it becomes a lure for more and more people to come illegally, which means it is going to make more money for the drug cartels. It is going to have more young women raped.

We are told that is occurring. About one in four girls coming to the United States through Mexico will end up being sexually assaulted, little boys at a lesser rate. I think I read 17 percent, something like that—just human tragedy.

It happens when well-meaning individuals in Congress think: Let's help those less fortunate by luring them to our country, not understanding that there is a tremendous amount of human suffering that goes on, in addition

to undermining the very foundation of what was the freest country in the world.

So everybody is now indicating that America is not the freest country in the world. We continue to add laws that keep taking more and more of our freedoms away. But I heard the majority leader ruing that we haven't had comprehensive immigration reform.

Well, in my time in Congress, what I have come to understand is, when you hear the term "comprehensive immigration reform," it normally means we want a bill that is so big and so massive that people who will vote on it won't have a chance to read it all and will be able to stick things in there that a majority would never agree to if they knew they were there. That is what I have come to see "comprehensive" meaning when it comes to legislation.

We are better off if we take subjects up individually, let people have a chance to read and know what is there, let them have a chance to analyze the language. Is this something likely to be struck down? If we don't have that opportunity, we pass legislation that is not what we want as a majority.

And as a majority—obviously, I am a Republican. We are in the minority. But I am talking about a majority of this body.

So we have these ongoing offers, which is what it is every time we pass a piece of legislation, even if it doesn't become law. That word is used by the drug cartels to encourage more people to pay them, to bring them in. That means they are going to have more employees—really, more like indentured servants—in the drug trade, in the human trafficking, sex trafficking trade, and people suffer as a result of well-intentioned but poorly thought-out legislation. We have got to do a better job on that.

Unfortunately, in the last term of Congress when Republicans had a majority in the House and the Senate, had a Republican President, we had leadership in both Houses that was not interested in securing our border or we could have passed a bill to do that. We could have passed a bill and gotten it into law.

But there are monied interests out there that contribute heavily and encourage people not to secure the border. Of course, I said before from this lectern, if you hear somebody who is elected in Mexico say, "We don't want the border secure; we don't want a wall anywhere on our border with the United States: Then you know that is someone who is getting money from the drug cartels. You can take that to the bank.

But you also heard well-intentioned but uneducated or miseducated individuals talk about what is happening on our border and even refer to the efforts to care for those who have come in illegally as concentration camps. If that were so, it would be the first time in human history that people have

flocked by the hundreds of thousands to voluntarily go into concentration camps, because that has never happened in the history of the world.

The Jews, during the 1930s and 1940s did not go flocking by their own choice into concentration camps that resulted in over 6 million deaths. They were forced into those.

The people who are coming voluntarily and illegally across our border, they are putting themselves at risk of sexual exploitation but also even for their very lives, because we constantly get reports about people dying trying to get in or getting in illegally and then being left by coyotes out somewhere to die.

We constantly, if you pay attention, get reports of our Border Patrol saving the lives—ICE agents—saving the lives of people who have come in illegally but have been abandoned by the drug cartels' coyotes.

So it is also interesting when you think about the facilities on our borders.

□ 1245

The concentration camps of World War II did not have Germany appropriating billions of dollars or their equivalent for them to have a more comfortable existence. That didn't happen.

That is why, clearly, they are not concentration camps, as people continue to flock there by the hundreds of thousands knowing what they are going into. But as they continue to hear that we are passing laws that will eventually allow them to be legalized if they come illegally, we are going to have the numbers that we are seeing there at this time.

In the past, we have been told that they feel like they are catching most of the people coming across. But if my colleagues spend a lot of time on the border as I have, the Border Patrol will say that what scares them is that they don't know what they don't know about the people coming in.

They do know that every time a big group comes across our border illegally and makes themselves available to be picked up and detained, that the drug cartels know. We have to put all of our people on duty trying to in-process these folks, and that is when the drug cartels know they can bring in big shipments of drugs, bring in people who otherwise may be a threat to our country.

We continue to hear from Federal officials about people coming. We just had a report in the last couple of weeks about the ISIS member who admitted that they are continuing to get radical Islamists who want to destroy our country into our country through our southern border by paying the drug cartels to bring them in with other people. That is all going on.

Then comes this article yesterday from The Washington Times, Stephen Dinan, that says, "The Border Patrol has documented more than 100,000 immigrants who they know managed to

illegally sneak past them and get into the interior of the country, the agency's Chief told Congress on Thursday, saying it's the most in 5 years."

Just for reference here, we do have balloons that can be floated up that have infrared or thermal technology, night vision. We have people on the border with night vision, thermal technology, so they can see the outline of individuals who get in, even when they are not caught.

But going back to the article: "Known as 'got aways,' the migrants are ones who agents detect but know they didn't manage to stop from crossing the border."

I need to insert here that our Border Patrol for a number of administrations has not been allowed to prevent people from coming into our country. We need to fix the law so they can prevent people from coming into the country using reasonable means.

I know when the Texas Department of Public Safety has their boats out on the Rio Grande where people are crossing, they don't cross because Texas DPS doesn't allow people to cross into Texas illegally if they can stop them.

The Border Patrol, on the other hand, has their hands tied. They have to allow them to come in illegally and then try to in-process them.

This article goes on. It says: "This high level of 'got aways' is a direct result of agents being reassigned away from the front line to provide humanitarian support to the unprecedented numbers of individuals and families in custody," Chief Carla Provost told the House Homeland Security Committee.

"The panel was meeting to hear how President Trump's orders to send National Guard and Active Duty troops to the border is playing out. Chief Provost said they've been a major boost, suggesting the got-away numbers might have been worse without the troops there to fill gaps left when her agents get pulled away to do babysitting duties for the families and unaccompanied children."

I have gotten pictures from our border of our actual Border Patrol pushing baby carriages, literally babysitting because these folks have been lured in by what we are doing here, what we are talking about here.

Chief Provost goes on to say, "That support as my agents are being pulled away to deal with the humanitarian crisis is key to us having situational awareness on the border," she said."

The article says, further down: "In one example last month, National Guard troops in Texas spotted a group of migrants rafting across the Rio Grande and reported it to Border Patrol agents. Agents, with the help of local police, corralled the group, whose members had paid up to \$10,000 to be smuggled into the U.S."

It says they corralled them, but what I didn't get until I started spending a lot of time on the border is that that doesn't mean they stopped them. It means they in-processed them into the United States.

Anyway, this article makes clear it is not even just the people who are coming in at a record pace this year. But just in 1 month, they think there may have been 100,000 people who came in that were not in-processed. They just came into the United States. Who knows if they want to do evil or good, but they certainly wanted to engage in illegal activity.

Another article here from Adam Shaw, "Illegal Immigrants from 52 Countries Crossed the U.S.-Mexico Border this Year." That is just so far. We are in June.

"The U.S. Border Patrol Chief testified Thursday that migrants from 52 countries have illegally crossed the border this year as she described an agency 'overwhelmed on a daily basis' by the escalating crisis."

She said, "While smugglers primarily target the Northern Triangle, family units from 52 countries have illegally crossed the southern border so far this year."

Further down, it says: "A Senate panel on Wednesday approved a \$4.6 billion request for funding to tackle the humanitarian crisis at the border, but only after including a condition that none of the money be used for a border wall."

As I understand our majority leader's discussion today, they are talking about emergency funding to deal with the humanitarian crisis, but actually, the way it is being talked about, it will contribute to the crisis because it will encourage more people who we are spending a new \$4.5 or \$4.6 billion on, to provide food and comfortable shelter for people who come in illegally.

That language is being drafted to ensure not only that it not be spent on the wall, but that it is not going to be spent at all on preventing people from coming in illegally. It is just going to be spent on the more and more volumes that are coming in illegally, which will, in this cyclical, worthless effort, encourage more to come in. We will have to appropriate billions and billions more for a bigger humanitarian crisis, and that will encourage more.

At some point, we have to take seriously, and I know there are a lot of people who don't like Biblical references—not very many, but some—but the fact is that it is the most quoted book in the history of our country. It was the most quoted book during the Constitutional Convention, and it continues to be the most quoted book in Congress.

If my colleagues look back in the Old Testament references, in Psalms, Proverbs, and other places, the best that we can hope and pray for is justice where the rich are treated like everybody else. They don't get any special consideration. And the poor are treated like everybody else and not given any special consideration. Everyone is treated fairly and equally under the law.

Yet, what we are seeing in this effort is that we are going to treat people who are trying to come into this coun-

try legally, we are going to penalize them. We are going to make them take 7 to 10 years, as some have, that we have tried to help family members with before.

But if they will just come illegally, we are going to treat them specially. We are going to ship them to a place the drug cartels want them to be to work as their employees or indentured servants. We are going to treat them specially. We are going to give them all kinds of things that people who are still waiting in foreign countries to get approval to come legally are not getting and will not get because they are trying to do things the legal way, while others are flooding the zone illegally.

That is not a good scenario for a country to continue to keep a self-governing system. Of course, we have billionaires that have donated large amounts of money to try to push us into being a socialist system. Of course, Marx didn't foresee the growth of a middle class the way we have had it here in the United States.

I continue to think that is the real strength of our country, the huge middle class. It shrank during the Obama administration when, for the first time in our history, 95 percent of the new income one year went to the top 1 percent income earners. The middle class shrunk. The poorest got poorer; the rich got richer; and the middle class shrunk.

That could end up leading to a communist revolution once we get to having that small ruling class and then the much larger poor class. Unfortunately, for the billionaires that contribute to help take us to a socialist system, they haven't been educated in history adequately to understand that if we go to a socialist system, normally, the billionaires' money is taken. They are put in prison or killed, and they don't end up being part of the elite ruling class as they had been so hopeful of.

We do have a crisis on our southern border, but it needs to be while we deal in a humane way with people who are here, that we also secure our border because otherwise, we are not a nation. If we don't have a border that is enforceable, we are not a nation. We are just a transient area. And if there is wealth in the area, it will not continue on for many more decades.

We had a hearing this week, changing gears, on the issue of reparations. It has been amazing how miseducated people have been on slavery, who supported it, who was against it; on civil rights, who supported it, who was against it. It has really been amazing.

□ 1300

There is an article here from Jeffrey Lord in *The American Spectator* from June 21.

It says: "So amidst the chaos of that congressional hearing on reparations for slavery, former NFL star Burgess Owens got straight to the point, saying this, as reported by BizPac Review:

'I used to be a Democrat until I did my history and found out the misery that that party brought to my race,' Owens said.

"He added, 'I do believe in restitution. Let's point to the party that was part of slavery, KKK, Jim Crow, that has killed over 40 percent of our Black babies, 20 million of them. State of California, 75 percent of our Black boys can't pass standard reading and writing test, a Democratic State. Let's pay reparation. Let's pay restitution. How about a Democratic Party pay for all the misery brought to my race.'"

The article by Mr. Lord says: "Bingo. Yet somehow, some mysterious way, the hard facts of history are blithely ignored by members and sycophants of the Democrats, the latter without doubt the party of race."

"Republican Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT of Texas had the audacity to quote from a 2008 article of mine that originally appeared in this space and was reprinted in *The Wall Street Journal*. Among other things in that article I noted these hard facts about what was missing from the website of the Democratic National Committee as it tried to portray itself as the champion of civil rights by leaving out the hard facts of the party's horrendous actual history on race."

Madam Speaker, these are the things he correctly notes that I read into the RECORD at our hearing.

This is from the Democrats' "Our History" section of their website.

He said: "There is no reference to the number of Democratic Party platforms supporting slavery."

"There were six from 1840 to 1860."

"There is no reference to the number of Democratic Presidents who owned slaves."

"There were seven from 1800 to 1861."

"There is no reference to the number of Democratic Party platforms that either supported segregation outright or were silent on the subject."

"There were 20, from 1868 through 1948."

"There is no reference to 'Jim Crow' as in 'Jim Crow laws,' nor is there reference to the role Democrats played in creating them. These were the post-Civil War laws passed enthusiastically by Democrats in that pesky 52-year part of the DNC's missing years. These laws segregated public schools, public transportation, restaurants, restrooms, and public places in general, everything from water coolers to beaches. The reason Rosa Parks became famous is that she sat in the 'whites only' front section of a bus, the 'whites only' designation the direct result of Democrats."

"There is no reference to the formation of the Ku Klux Klan, which, according to Columbia University historian Eric Foner, became 'a military force serving the interests of the Democratic Party.' Nor is there reference to University of North Carolina historian Allen Trelease's description of the Klan as the 'terrorist arm of the Democratic Party.'"

"There is no reference to the fact Democrats opposed the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments to the Constitution. The 13th banned slavery."

Madam Speaker, on further down: "There is no reference to the fact that Democrats opposed the Civil Rights Act of 1866. It was passed by the Republican Congress over the veto of President Andrew Johnson, who had been a Democrat before joining Lincoln's ticket in 1864."

"There is no reference to the Democrats' opposition to the Civil Rights Act of 1875."

Anyway, Madam Speaker, it goes on and on here. But it was amazing to me and this article points out: "Tellingly, when Congressman GOHMERT was finished reciting these hard, cold, and quite accurate facts of history, someone in the audience yelled out, 'You lie.' An unwitting admission of absolute historical ignorance or maybe just plain denial. And over at the website *Splinter* writer Samantha Grasso assailed Gohmert as the 'dumbest Republican in the room' for daring to cite the Democrats' appalling historical record."

So anyway, Madam Speaker, it is an interesting time. Education is important, but it has got to be accurate education.

One other thing I would like to quickly reference is the need for criminal justice reform within our military. There are some aspects of military justice that are very good.

In the grand jury process in the civilian sector, constitutionally the defendant, potential defendant, is not allowed to be there, nor to have his attorney there or her attorney. Attorneys are not allowed to be there for a potential defendant when that potential defendant is actually testifying before the grand jury.

Whereas, in the military system of justice, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, there is what is called an Article 32 investigation which is sort of the equivalent, except a potential accused, as we call them in the military, is allowed to be there and have an attorney there to see what is being said against him and to give a chance to present evidence to the Article 32 investigating officer.

But one of the problems—and it is a very, very serious problem—is that the charges are sent to a court-martial by the commander, normally a commanding general or admiral. He is called the convening authority. He puts his signature on there saying: 'I want this individual charged and tried in a court-martial for this offense. That is after reviewing the results of the Article 32 investigation.'

But where it becomes rather unfair is that to get a jury—I saw this during my 4 years at Fort Benning—the commanding general has each unit—we have platoons that make up companies. Platoons would offer suggestions of hard-nosed guys that would convict anybody who was sent if they were on

the jury, and they were referred up to the company commander. The company commander would choose those that he thought were the very best out of those nominated, and he would refer them up to the battalion commander. The battalion commander would winnow that group down to the very toughest who would follow what the commander would want them to do and send those up to brigade. The brigade would take them and review them and decide to get it down to a number that they would send up, and eventually it would get to the commanding general of installation, and he would pick maybe up to 15 people who would sit, sometimes for 6 months, on every court-martial during that time.

They knew why they were there. They knew why the commanding general put them on the jury. They were sent there to convict the guys that the general sent to be tried.

There were a number of acquittals, but I can tell you every time there was an acquittal in a court-martial, you never saw that jury panel again. They may have been new, but if they acquitted somebody, found them not guilty, the general immediately disbanded them as a jury panel. It is not like you have jury selection where you can challenge somebody and have them taken off the jury.

I remember one court-martial where virtually all of the jury said that if a defendant did not testify, they would hold it against him and find him guilty just because he didn't testify.

The judge said: Hey, we are all part of this man's Army, and if I instruct you—and I will instruct you—that you will not hold it against the defendant that he doesn't testify, will you follow my direct order not to consider it against?

Oh, oh, okay. Sure. We didn't know you were going to instruct us not to.

But they had already made clear that, yeah, they are going to hold it against him.

So a defendant's constitutional rights in a military court-martial can sometimes be illusory. I think we are seeing that with Eddie Gallagher out in California. Even after a witness came forward and said that he is the one who asphyxiated the deceased who was wounded, he was an ISIS member, that Eddie Gallagher didn't kill him, they still continue on with the court-martial.

From what I saw at Fort Benning, if you had somebody come in and say: "I am actually the one who did it," I have seen a good military judge say then: Mr. Prosecutor, do you have a motion to dismiss at this time?

And they would make a motion to dismiss.

But, really, I have a great deal of concern. I saw in a brief that someone had prepared for a parole matter that there was out of World Wars I and II, Korea, and Vietnam, it said there were seven American military members convicted of war crimes, but since then,

the Iraq war, Desert Storm, Kuwait, and Afghanistan, we had over 200.

This is something that needs to be looked at. We should not have our military members risking conviction simply by trying to defend themselves and those around them. So I am hoping that we can come together in a bipartisan way and make some changes, some corrections, and some improvements to military justice so that our heroes don't get killed trying to avoid being seen as criminals by people who don't understand what they are going through.

So, in any event, I am hopeful that we will do something next week to help fund border security, but it sounds like from what we have heard on the floor all we are going to do is help attract more people to come in illegally because we are going to send \$4 billion or so down to the border.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of a family medical emergency.

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2019.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA) and H. Res. 293 (116th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the *Congressional Record* a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2020 published in the *Congressional Record* on May 3, 2019, as adjusted.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for program integrity initiatives, pursuant to H. Res. 293. These amounts are contained in the text of H.R. 3351, the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2020 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2020. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the *Congressional Record* on May 3, 2019, as adjusted.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

| | 2020 | 2020–2029 |
|------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Current Aggregates: | | |
| Budget Authority | 3,798,177 | n.a. |

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES—
Continued
[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

| | 2020 | 2020–2029 |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Outlays | 3,725,991 | n.a. |
| Revenues | 2,740,533 | 34,847,515 |
| Revision for the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2020 (H.R. 3351): | | |
| Budget Authority | 400 | n.a. |
| Outlays | 338 | n.a. |
| Revenues | --- | --- |
| Revised Aggregates: | | |
| Budget Authority | 3,798,577 | n.a. |
| Outlays | 3,726,329 | n.a. |
| Revenues | 2,740,533 | 34,847,515 |

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
[In millions of dollars]

| | 2020 |
|---|-----------|
| Current Discretionary Action: | |
| BA | 1,383,610 |
| OT | 1,410,474 |
| Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 3351): | |
| BA | 400 |
| OT | 338 |
| Revised Allocation: | |
| BA | 1,384,010 |
| OT | 1,410,812 |
| Current Law Mandatory: | |
| BA | 1,075,820 |
| OT | 1,067,358 |

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3151. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue service, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 60. Joint Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to authorize unique and one-time arrangements for displays on the National Mall and the Washington Monument during the period beginning on July 16, 2019 and ending on July 20, 2019.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 24, 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:

1362. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Electronic Filing of Notices for Apprenticeship and Training Plans and Statements for Pension Plans for Certain Select Employees (RIN: 1210-AB62) received June 19, 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.

1363. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled, "FY 2018 Superfund Five-Year Review Report to Congress", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 9621(c); Public Law 96-510, Sec. 121(c); (100 Stat. 1673); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1364. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from September 10, 2018 to November 9, 2018 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1365. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report covering the period from November 10, 2018, to January 9, 2019 on the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 107-243, Sec. 4(a); (116 Stat. 1501) and 50 U.S.C. 1541 note; Public Law 102-1, Sec. 3 (as amended by Public Law 106-113, Sec. 1000(a)(7)); (113 Stat. 1501A-422); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1366. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting twenty-five (25) notifications of a federal vacancy, a designation of acting officer, a nomination, an action on nomination, a discontinuation of service in acting role, or a change in previously submitted reported information, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1367. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's FY 2018 NO FEAR Act report, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 2301 note; Public Law 107-174, 203(a) (as amended by Public Law 109-435, Sec. 604(f)); (120 Stat. 3242); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1368. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, of the Office of Inspector General, covering the period October 1, 2018, through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1369. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of a final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2019-03; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2019-0002, Sequence No. 2] received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1370. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's Small Entity Compliance Guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2019-03 [Docket No.: FAR 2019-0002; Sequence No.: 2] received June 18, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1371. A letter from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Exception from Certified Cost or Pricing Data Requirements—Adequate Price Competition [FAC 2019-03; FAR Case 2017-006; Docket No.: 2017-0006, Sequence No.: 1] (RIN: 9000-AN53) received June