

15, that the law requires that Congress enact a budget resolution. Obviously, that ain't gonna happen. However, the Republican-led Budget Committee did share a budget blueprint with the GOP leadership. Ultimately, the leadership decided that it wasn't harsh enough on families, seniors, or children to pass through a Republican majority.

A Federal budget should be a reflection of our values as a Nation, and the details of the rumored proposal of a road to ruin that the Republicans want to release are just not good. Apparently, the attempt to end the Medicare guarantee for seniors, to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and to block investments in good-paying jobs was not sufficiently brutal enough for the radicals within the Republican Party. If this version of the budget could not muster enough support to be brought to the House floor for a vote, I fear what the Republican majority will actually propose.

House Democrats should continue to press for a budget that creates jobs, grows paychecks, and invests in the future of the American people, like we always do. We believe in those values, and that is what we will continue to fight for.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1670. An act to direct the Architect of the Capitol to place in the United States Capitol a chair honoring American Prisoners of War/Missing in Action.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1436. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

#### “A REPUBLIC, MADAM, IF YOU CAN KEEP IT”

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, being argued before the United States Supreme Court—the eight Justices remaining—is a case of *United States v. Texas*. It will take up the President's—I started to say his “executive order,” but, actually, in the case of His Majesty's program on amnesty, there actually was no executive order that was signed by the President. Like you find in a lot of countries around the world where there is a dictator, there was a speech made and comments made by the ruler. Then the Secretary of Homeland Security—in our case, Secretary Johnson—wrote a series of memos to carry out the dicta-

tion from on high, and they overrode the laws that were duly passed by both Houses of Congress and by previous Presidents.

That is where we run into some trouble. That is where you run into trouble in doing what Benjamin Franklin suggested might be possible to undo. As we know, a lady asked him at the Constitutional Convention, “What did you give us?” and he said, “A Republic, Madam, if you can keep it.” One of the ways you do not keep representative government—self-government through the electing of Representatives to do the will of the people—is to go and have those elections and elect people who pass laws—I mean, the Founders wanted government to have gridlock.

As I mentioned before, Justice Scalia, in talking to a group of 50 or so senior citizens from my district, explained that the reason we are the freest country in history—or at least we used to be. The indicators indicate we are not the freest country anymore, but the reason we became, for a while there, the freest country in history was that the Founders did not trust government. They knew that, if it were too easy for a government to make laws or to just dictate what would happen in a country, then people would not be free.

They pledged their lives, liberty, sacred honor—they pledged everything. Many—most, actually—of the signers of the Declaration of Independence did not have very pleasant lives after the signing of that. Many lost their treasures, their fortunes. They never lost their sacred honor. They pledged it, and they never lost their sacred honor.

When you look at all of the sacrifices that were made to try to allow us to have representative, self-government—and as difficult as it is to pass a bill here in the House and have the Senate pass the same bill or a similar bill and, if they are not the same, to go to conference and try to work out a bill that is the same and get it passed in both Houses and send it to the President and get the President to sign it and have the Supreme Court say, yes, that it is consistent with the Constitution—that is very difficult.

All of those things have happened with regard to our immigration law that the President talked about, as any good ruler would; and, of course, as any good ruler, he had a Secretary of Homeland Security who did memos and said: Okay. We are going to just not pay any attention to that law. Here is the new law.

□ 1200

I was amazed to hear all of the major networks, including Fox News, talk about “Here is the new program,” “Here is the new plan” after memos were concocted that overrode the laws that were duly passed in the House and Senate and signed previously by the President, who just overrode the law and said: We are not going to do that. We have, in their opinion, the discretion to just ignore the law and do what we want.

There is a good article out of the Hoover Institution journal written by Michael McConnell. It just came out on April 15. I thought it did a good job of discussing these issues that are coming up before the Supreme Court on Monday.

Also, by way of further preface, the decision originated in the Southern District of Texas before United States District Judge Andrew Hanen, who happened to be one of the smartest people in his class and, actually, going through law school, one of the more liberal people in our class in law school, but a brilliant guy.

The more he delved into issues, the better lawyer he became. He was with one of the best firms in Houston. He has become a profoundly good arbitrator of justice as a United States judge.

So Judge Hanen wrote a very lengthy order in which he enjoined in carrying out the wishes that were dictated by the Secretary of Homeland Security because they violate the law. They say: We are ignoring the law. And the judge could see that there are massive consequences.

Although right here in this very room the President said that we are not going to cover people that are illegally in the country with his ObamaCare, it turns out that that wasn't true.

We have, apparently, massive numbers who get the income tax credit, whether legally or not. I have people constantly telling me they work for different income tax services and they provide services to people that don't have Social Security numbers that are legitimate.

They all know about the earned income tax credit, and they all want it on there. They all claim it. Whether they can tell you where their kids are or not, they want that credit.

There has been some massive projections of just how much in millions or billions is being paid out. We previously had reporting about, just in one little community, how numerous people claim to live in one home and claim to have as many as 30 kids or so in that home so they could claim all those earned income tax credits so they could get a big refund.

There is massive amounts of money that is being taken from those who earned it and given to those who have come into the country illegally.

I don't have the articles in front of me. There are articles out this week talking about that, actually, by more than the current unemployment rate—even the real rate, not the one that is just made up—it doesn't include the 94 million or so who are eligible to work, have tried to find work and given up trying to find work.

But either number you care to use, we have that percentage of people who have immigrated to America. Thank God for legal immigration.

Perhaps one in six people working in America are first-generation immigrants. That is great, but the trouble is