

this lawsuit and they are saying: We need to know who is in the country illegally and who is not so we can get a fair count.

And people that have been saying, on the one hand: We want everybody that is coming into the country illegally to come out of the shadows; when it comes to apportionment, they are saying: No, no, no, no, we want them counted, but you can't ask them whether they are here illegally or not. So we want their status to stay in the shadows. We want to keep their status secret.

Sanctuary cities are basically doing the same thing. They might as well put the Statue of Liberty out in San Francisco harbor saying: Give us your tired, your poor, your felons, your people that like to shoot other people and rob them, because that is basically what San Francisco has been saying: We don't care if you are a felon, we don't care if you kill people, you rape women, or raped anybody, we want you here, and we won't tell on you, so you come right in here.

I am going to file a bill. I have been working on it too long. I haven't gotten the cooperation I thought I should from some folks. But, anyway, basically, I think it ought to be a civil right living in a city in the United States that is violated when a city says: We are going to welcome, encourage, really try to recruit people to be in our city who are felons, who are here illegally and felons.

And when that kind of action under State law robs people of their lives or their sexual purity or any other thing, there ought to be a cause of action against that city or that State that is saying: We encourage people that are here illegally and who are committing felonies, we want you here.

That really ought to be a right of the others who are U.S. citizens that is being violated by the sanctuary city or the sanctuary State. So if a State or city wants to keep encouraging felons to live within their bounds and it costs people their lives or their property, there ought to be a civil rights lawsuit lodged against that State or city government, or county government for that matter.

So we will get it done and we will get it filed. That way it is fair. So, say, if San Francisco, for example, wants to keep encouraging people, like the guy that shot Kate Steinle, to come into the city, and that way others may be similarly situated, as was Kate Steinle, and get shot and killed as they beg their daddy to help them, I mean, I just can't imagine anything much worse than that as a father.

The father should not have his lawsuit thrown out of court, as happened in the Steinle case. We ought to give the means to the aggrieved party to say to San Francisco, or say to the city or State when they are acting as a sanctuary city or State: Do you know what, you can do that if you want, but you are going to monetarily pay to the

people who are harmed under your State or city color of law. It just seems fair.

So, hopefully, we will get something done on that and let the lawsuits commence against the sanctuary cities. As a former lawyer who tried a lot of cases, I have seen the good that can come. Sometimes there are places where the litigation system is abused, often a topic on FOX News, but there are some laws we don't really have to pass if you have a good court system that aggrieved parties can come in and they can sue and collect.

And just the threat of that suit and collection voids the needs for us to come in here or run in and pass a law every time there is some illegality or impropriety or some damage done to other parties. Let the courts mete it out.

When somebody is penalized financially in a sufficient amount, then it will change their conduct. I think you would see sanctuary cities change once their taxpayers realize they are going to keep paying out multimillion dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars constantly in court costs and damages assessed.

□ 1445

I bet you would see a whole lot of folks say: Do you know what? Maybe it is time that we quit having a sanctuary in our city for people who came in illegally and who also commit violent felonies or property theft or whatever it is. Let's protect people and give them that right through litigation.

Now, this article from Bob Price says: "Border Patrol Agents Arrest Sex Offenders, Gang Members in South Texas." It points out that: "Border patrol agents assigned to the Rio Grande Valley Sector stopped sex offenders and gang members from making their way to their U.S. destinations over the weekend. During a 4-day period, agents arrested four child molesters and three gang members after they illegally crossed the border. The arrests include fugitives who fled the country to avoid prosecution and previously deported criminal aliens."

"Rio Grande City Station agents arrested a man who illegally crossed the border near Roma, Texas, on Sunday. During processing, agents learned the Salvadoran national was convicted in Angleton, Texas, in February 2015 for a 2014 charge of sexual assault of a child. The Salvadoran national received a 5-year prison sentence and was deported after being released early by prison officials."

And then obviously coming back, some other child was probably saved from another sexual assault, because I know from my experience as a prosecutor and a felony judge, when somebody is that kind of evil that they would commit that kind of assault on a child, it just seems to be the kind of evil that they keep coming back to.

So it is something that needs to stop. Thank God we have Border Patrol officers who are protecting us.

I would just encourage our own Republican leadership, what got President Trump elected was he was promising that we would build a wall. He was promising an end to the unconstitutional DACA that Obama did. He was promising no amnesties. So I think in the time we have left in this year, wouldn't it be a good idea if we as Republicans in the House quit worrying about a discharge petition and started being concerned about keeping our promises to the American people?

Let's get the wall built where it is needed, but for heaven's sake, get the border secure. Secure the border so people coming in are coming in lawfully.

We should not have to process anybody who comes in anywhere except through an authorized entry point into our country. If you try to come in another way, the Federal officers ought to do like the State of Texas officers do, and that is stand in the way: You are not coming into our country. You are not putting a foot on American soil until you come in legally.

But the Federal officers haven't been doing that, and we need to make that happen as well. That is what we do. Once we have secured the borders, then we can work something out about who is here and who stays, who goes.

But until then, the border patrolmen again reaffirmed for me this last week, every time we mention DACA, amnesty, any kind of legalization, any kind of stay, any kind of path to this, that, or the other, there is another surge of people illegally coming into the country. Let's stop the surges. Let's do whatever it takes to secure the border. Let's forget about discharge petitions.

Concentrate on that secured border. That will keep our oath. That will keep our promise. That defends the Constitution, and it also actually helps people get reelected, because we kept our promises.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 12, 2018, 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:

5083. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Threshold for De Minimis Activity and Exemptions From Licensing Under the Animal Welfare Act [Docket No.: APHIS-